# Tartaria Empire

Jan Lavrinovski

# Table of Contents

Truth Can Be Calculated....1
Alchemy of the Pyramids....9
Mystery Of The Egyptian Zodiacs....19
Lord Novgorod the Great, who are you?....28
Kulikovo field. Battle for Moscow....38
Russia-Horde....48
In What Century Did Christ Live?....57
Forgotten Jerusalem....66
The Moscow Kremlin....76
Reconstruction of True History....87
Falsification of written history....97
Crafts and counterfeits....106
Three Great Forgeries....115
Ivan the Terrible....124
Time of Troubles, Boris Godunov, False Dmitry....133
The First Romanovs....141
How Russian History Was Written....151
Radziwiłł Chronicle....159
Reformation. The Dissolution of the Empire....167
Soldiers of the Empire. Cathars. Razin. Pugachev....176
Etruscans are Russians....185
Symbols of Ancient Rome....193

## Truth Can Be Calculated

Despite the fact that there are still many gaps in history, historians argue that they have a good understanding of mankind's past in general. The events that took place in different countries and with different peoples, the sequence of these events, the names of rulers, and the biographies of entire dynasties are all known. In addition, scientists use many methods to try to clarify the details and dates of events and even restore unknown pages of history. Historians are convinced that history as a science primarily relies on historical documents, as well as on archaeological finds and preserved objects of material culture. In many ways this is true; however, not everything is so simple. As we showed in the second part of our series, almost all traditional dating methods used today have significant shortcomings and limitations. Moreover, when determining the age of artifacts and objects of material culture using these methods, errors of hundreds and even thousands of years can occur. There are thousands of examples of incorrect dating, meaning that the traditional chronology of historical events cannot be considered entirely accurate. Therefore, it turns out that history itself is to a large extent a myth, fiction, and novel, and humanity knows much less about itself than is commonly thought. How, then, is it possible to discover the true history of mankind? How is it possible to uncover a way to reveal the truth? First, we will tell the story of one discovery. In the 1970s of the last century, the 20th century, the Russian mathematician Anatoly Timofeevich Fomenko worked on the problem of celestial mechanics. For these studies, the parameters of the Moon's movement around the Earth are of great importance. Unexpectedly, Fomenko was faced with an interesting scientific work dealing with such studies. This work belonged to Robert Russell Newton, an American astrophysicist and mathematician, head of the NASA Data Center, who at that time was working on creating a space navigation network. The American scientist based his calculations on the dates of lunar eclipses taken from ancient chronicles. In these annals, there were 370 such eclipses. The American scientist analyzed them, performed the necessary calculations and obtained a complete description of the movement of the natural satellite of our planet. Newton recorded the result in his scientific works, which ended up in Anatoly Fomenko's hands. According to the research of the American astrophysicist, it was discovered that radical changes occurred in the Moon's movement from approximately 800 BC to 1000 AD. During this period of time, the Moon began to move faster, and then its speed slowed down to normal values. Such a cataclysm cannot be explained in any way within the framework of Isaac Newton's mechanics and the modern gravitational theory of the Moon's motion around the Earth. According to the laws of physics, the rotation speed of the Earth's satellite could not change so dramatically. So, what is the root cause? The American astrophysicist concluded that the actions of some mysterious force were to blame for all of this. What is this force? Why it never showed up again, Robert Newton could not explain. Moreover, the discussion on this problem, organized by the British Academy of Sciences in 1972, had failed to elucidate the situation in anyway. The task intrigued the Russian mathematician Anatoly Fomenko, who decided to figure it out. Newton's calculations seemed to be correct, but the conclusion seemed rather strange. As a result, the solution was found where apparently no one thought to look. The calculations of the American astrophysicist were based on the dates of solar and lunar eclipses taken from ancient chronicles. Namely, they should have been checked in the first place. It was found that the dating of ancient eclipses can be inaccurate. I once heard in the corridors of the Faculty of Mechanics and Mathematics about a remarkable Russian scientist, Nikolai Moro'zov, who, as I heard from these stories, expressed the opinion that the old eclipses were apparently incorrectly dated, and should be re-dated. He published his results in a famous book; seven volumes entitled "Christ". I asked to bring me this volume, which contains his eclipse

recalculation tables. I did see the new dates proposed by Nikolai Moro'zov for eclipses, including those from antiquity, the early and late Middle Ages. Then, I did the following. I took Robert Newton's algorithm and kept everything except the eclipse dates. I inserted the new dates proposed by Nikolai Moro'zov into this algorithm and repeated Newton's calculations. After that, it turned out that the graph became a constant line on the time axis. The strange, amazing effect disappeared, the leaps disappeared, and there was no need to invent some mysterious forces in the Earth-Moon system. Thus, I solved a very interesting and non-trivial problem of celestial mechanics. The calculations made by Robert Newton and the first justified suspicions became the beginnings of a great scientific research. Having carefully studied the dating methods used by historians and archaeologists, as well as all the works of Nikolai Moro'zov, Anatoly Fomenko concluded that not only the dates of eclipses are wrong, but ancient chronicles may also contain unreliable information. One must start from the very basics to verify this. It is known that the traditional version of the chronology was proposed by the French philologist, publisher and commentator of ancient texts Joseph Scaliger, in the second half of the 16th century. In his work "Study on the Improvement of Time", he described the chronologies of different peoples and is believed to have brought them into line with each other. He was also the first to apply the method of astronomically dating of events by eclipse. Almost four centuries later, Anatoly Fomenko discovered that the medieval method was imperfect, and moreover, it was used with serious errors. So he set out to find new, more accurate ways of dating historical events. Only in this way can the true chronology of world history be reconstructed. Fomenko's opponents appeared immediately. Evidently, the first were historians. Different representatives will attend and have a word… Those who spoke before me were wrong. It was not Moro'zov who laid the foundation. Newton started with his two descriptions. And Newton, Isaac Newton is the greatest scientist. Scientist number one. History is not a chronological outline and a sequence of events. It is a process, a complex process. Action, components associated with the system. I must state with full responsibility that everything in the works of Anatoly Timofeevich Fomenko, relating to ancient Russian history, has nothing to do with either mathematical methods or mathematics in general. Historians have claimed that finding dates and collecting documentary evidence are the realms of history, not mathematics. However, this behavior of historians was incorrect. As a science, chronology appeared only in the 16th century AD and has long been a branch of applied mathematics. It's understandable why. It was mathematicians who were engaged in astronomical calculations, assessing their accuracy, and decoding old texts. It was quite logical that in the 20th century a mathematician decided to check the accuracy of these calculations. Anatoly Fomenko began this work in 1973, and within 8 years he developed new dating methods. In those years, he worked almost solely. But fortunately, later he had people who shared his opinions. Work began to move forward much more quickly. With the help of his supporters, Anatoly Fomenko successfully develops previously created methods, as well as creating new mathematical and statistical dating methods. In recent years, several methods have been created in collaboration with mathematician Gleb Vladimirovich Nosovsky. In 1981, my co-author Gleb Vladimirovich Nosovsky appeared, and together we created another new method in addition to those I created from 1973 to 1980. Then we began working together with Vladimir Vyacheslavovich Kalashnikov and my wife Tatyana Nikolaievna Fomenko. Here is a team that has been formed many years ago, and we have been working together since then. Unfortunately, Kalashnikov is no longer with us, so Nosovsky, Tatyana Nikolaievna Fomenko and I are mainly carrying out the latest work. The mathematical methods developed by Fomenko, Nosovsky, and Kalashnikov are precise scientific instruments. With their help, one can check almost any historical documents, annals, maps, biographies of royal dynasties. Following certain rules, any document can be formalized. It becomes a kind of statistical unit and is carefully cross-analyzed using several methods and tools. One does not need to be a mathematician to understand how these unique methods work. We will not use numerous formulas and calculations and will deliberately simplify our story in order to show the main thing, the essence of these methods. Is it even possible to compare different texts?

Sure, one can, everyone would answer, as any text has its own specific meaning. And if we compare not just texts, but historical documents? For example, different chronicles at first glance appear to describe completely different events that took place in different countries and different eras. But what if, in fact, they tell about the same historical event? It turns out that this is possible. But how do we recognize it? Certainly, we can determine if these texts are interconnected or not by their meaning. However, one cannot always evaluate information objectively. He may be hindered by stereotypes instilled in childhood. But if you do not rely on subjective opinions, then how do you check whether texts speak about the same period of history or about different ones? It often happens that two descriptions appear to be completely different. It is such a completely different situation. The two chronicles are allegedly vastly different. However, according to mathematical analysis, they turn out to be very close for some reason. If you have two unknown keys in your hands, how can you tell if they are the same or different? The easiest way to tell is to insert the keys into the lock. But what if this is not possible? The person simply compares the tooth profile drawings. If they match, then the keys are identical. Maybe it sounds incredible, but you can also compare the texts the same way. To do this, they must each be presented in the form of a graph, and then compared. But how to do that? Each historical text describes events in a certain sequence, namely, by year. This means that it can be divided into certain segments, for example, one year per segment. Then we look at how much textual material refers to each year, that is, to each segment. You can count the number of pages of text, lines or characters. The main thing is to get a number characterizing the volume of the text. Years are marked on the x-axis horizontally. On the vertical y-axis, we mark the obtained numbers for the volume of the material. For example, the description of the first year in this text takes three pages, the second five, the third none; it could happen so, the fourth ten, and so on. We build the same graph for the second text. These two zigzag lines with a large number of toothing are the forms of the texts, and the form can already be compared. Peaks, that is, the upper points of the teeth, are called local maxima by mathematicians, and the method itself has been given such a name: the local maxima method. In this method, the resulting graphs are compared point by point. In this case, the height of the points on the graphs does not play a special role. What is important is whether the years of bursts coincide on the timeline. If the locations of the bursts coincide, then the profiles of both graphs turn out to be dependent. The method was tested on several dozen texts, and each time it proved to be effective. It turned out that if the texts discuss the same flow of events, the bursts on the charts occur almost simultaneously. Such a coincidence can be found by comparing, for example, two texts "The History of Rome" by the ancient Roman historian Titus Livius and "Essays on the History of Ancient Rome" by the Soviet historian Vladimir Sergueyev. The forms of these texts make bursts almost simultaneously. It turns out that we are talking about the same events. In this case, it is quite clear from the text. Both books are about ancient Rome. Let's use this method to consider chronicles that tell of supposedly disparate events and date back to different years. This is the "Tale of Bygone Years", believed to have been written in the 10th-11th century. And this is the Niki'forov Manuscript, which according to the historian, was written in the XIV-XV centuries. Historians claim that these documents are separated by almost four centuries and describe completely different events. But the graphs of these annals unexpectedly coincide with each other. The strict mathematical calculations prove that we are likely talking about the same historical time. This means that the age of one of the documents has been incorrectly identified, and the discrepancy is between 300 and 400 years. There are quite a few examples like this. Therefore, only with the help of a method of statistical mathematics it is possible to objectively analyze old texts. Without them, it is unfortunately impossible to construct a chronology. If a person sees that the outlines of the keys are the same, he makes the only correct conclusion. These keys open the same lock. And they persistently try to convince him that the keys are different. Will he believe? Hardly. The truth in this case is obvious for him and is corroborated by evidence. Ancient geographical maps can also tell a lot of interesting things. After all, what is a map? This is humanity's idea of the world at the time it was created. It is natural to assume that it all

started with primitive schemes that bear little resemblance to maps as we know them. As navigation developed, wars were fought, trade relations were established, and new information about lands and countries emerged. This information was very important for every country. Therefore, it was necessarily applied to the maps, and with each era, the maps became more and more accurate and perfect. Here is an example of a very rare map from 1522, compiled by Aucupario. Europe and Asia are very different from modern representations. Greenland is depicted as a peninsula of Europe, the Black Sea is skewed vertically, the Caspian Sea is almost unrecognizable, and China is absent altogether. The map of Cornelius Nicholas from 1598 also suffers from distortions, but there are far fewer of them than on the preceding map. This is a unique monument of European cartography, the “Big Globe of Blau”, made by the renowned Dutch company Blau at the end of the 17th century, commissioned by King Charles XI of Sweden. It can be seen with the naked eye that it is much closer to reality than previous maps were. The outlines of the continents have become much more accurate, many new lands have appeared. This example clearly shows that with each subsequent map, the number of correct geographical information increased and the number of erroneous ones decreased. It is similar to how children draw as they grow up. A six-year-old kid will draw the world around him very simply and naively. Trees are sticks, people are round, disproportionately large flowers and fabulous animals. In the drawing of a ten-year-old child, the proportions become more realistic, people appear more or less lifelike, and most likely there will be no fairy-tale characters at all. And finally, a 16-year-old teenager will attempt to draw all the details, movements, and eyes. It is almost impossible to confuse the sequence of these drawings. It is possible to compare geographic maps in the same way. However, for serious research, visual comparison alone is not sufficient. It is necessary to obtain scientific confirmation. The Anatoly Fomenko’s method allowing doing this is called "The Method of Correct Chronological Ordering and Dating of Ancient Geographical Maps." Let's take a few old maps. For example, Schedel's map, which historians believe was issued in 1493. A map of Peter Apian, allegedly from 1520. Map of Solinus, 1538 issue. And a map from the atlas of Mercator Hondius from 1607. Each map will be assigned a serial number depending on the official date of its inception. Next, it is necessary to get a complete description of each map. To do this, a table is compiled in which all the information about the map is entered. Is the map flat or is it a globe, a world map or a regional one? The table must include the locations of the poles, the equator, climatic zones, a description of the seas, countries, etc. Anatoly Fomenko referred to this table of geographical features as a map-code. In fact, it is a formalized map model. The same tables are compiled for the rest of the maps selected for comparison. Now the collected information allows for plotting a graph. On the horizontal axis we mark the serial number of the map, on the vertical axis, the number of incorrect features of the map. Let's say there are 24 of them. With each new map, incorrect features that do not correspond to real geography will gradually decrease, while those that are correct, such as a strait or an exact outline of the coast, will remain. Thus, the total number of incorrect features will decrease and the graph will show a downward curve. Then the same method was applied to maps of antiquity and the early Middle Ages. It turned out that the emerging dates are absolutely not consistent with what we know from modern tables. For example, the famous maps of Ptolemy, supposedly antique maps of the 2nd century AD, fell around the 15th-16th century AD, moved up along the timeline by at least 1000 years. Further, say the maps of Hesiod and Euclid also turned out to be by no means from the fifth – third century BC, but also fell into the Middle Ages, in the period of the 12th – 13th centuries of the Common era. The famous Peutinger Map, an ancient map of the Roman Empire, also moved up along the timeline and ended up approximately in the 15th century AD. We are looking at the famous map of Hanns Rüüst from 1480. It is evident that this is not even a map, but merely a pleasant drawing. In principle, this corresponds to the development of cartography in the 15th century. Now, for comparison, let's take one of the purported ancient maps of Ptolemy. The contradiction is obvious. The map, supposedly from the 2nd century AD, corresponds to the idea of the geography of the Columbus era. It turns out that long before the 15th century, in antiquity,

mankind created detailed pictorial maps of a fairly high level. Then it suddenly lost all knowledge and skills and reverted to primitive schemes. However, no global catastrophes have been experienced by humankind. Its development did not cease, and new generations did not have to re-learn the world from scratch. Then, where did the supposedly ancient origin of sufficiently realistic geographical maps come from? Historians themselves cannot explain this paradox in the development of cartography. However, the explanation is provided by Fomenko's method of ordering geographical maps. It is this method that makes it possible to calculate the true time of appearance of the so-called ancient Ptolemy maps. They were created no earlier than the 15th – 16th centuries AD. And this means that in traditional chronology not just negligence was made; the error is hundreds, and sometimes thousands of years. It is unlikely that anyone would believe that a small child, who had just learned to hold a pencil in his hand, could draw an accurate and vivid portrait of a person. And then, instead of creating new paintings, he began to draw gnarled stick trees and disproportionately large flowers again. Such a sequence is unlikely. Most likely, the children's drawings just got mixed up. This is the only explanation. Among historians, there has long been an opinion that sometimes chroniclers attributed to their contemporary rulers the qualities and deeds of some other, long-deceased ancient kings. Traditional history assures us that such a strange fascination with antiquity among the chroniclers was widespread. Because of this, quite a lot of similar biographies of ancient rulers appeared in history. To identify such repetitions, it is not enough to just study a large number of historical biographies. The information received must be organized somehow. For this, Anatoly Fomenko developed a table, which he called the Form-code. In the form of such a questionnaire, one can write down any biographical account, and then examine it objectively, disregarding the subjective assessments of the chroniclers. The form-code consists of 34 fields and contains detailed information about the ruler, his gender, life span, period of reign, his status (e.g. emperor, commander, religious leader), cause of death of the ruler, natural disasters, astronomical phenomena, wars, conspiracies and much more, that happened during his reign. Anatoly Fomenko did an immense task. He compiled form-codes for several hundred major ancient rulers. Now it is enough to just take any form-code and compare it with others. It is significant that with the help of this method it is possible to compare not only individual chronicle biographies, but also entire dynasties of rulers. Let's choose two dynasties for comparison. From each dynasty, we will choose, for example, 20 form-codes of kings who ruled sequentially, that is, one after another. Anatoly Fomenko referred to this sequence as "the flow of form-codes." Initially, the form-codes of the first ruler of one dynasty and the first ruler of another dynasty are compared. Then the form-codes of the subsequent ruler of the first dynasty and the subsequent ruler of the second dynasty are compared, and so on. With such a comparison, it is important to note that if only two compared biographies are similar, it does not necessarily mean anything! There are many such similar biographies throughout history. It is quite clear that no chronological conclusions should be drawn from this. To calculate how close two dynasties are to each other, Anatoly Fomenko developed a special coefficient. It is used to compare each pair of form-codes. For better clarity of comparison, the flows of form-codes can be depicted graphically. Let's mark the serial number of each ruler of the first dynasty we have chosen horizontally, and the time of his reign in years vertically. Fomenko refers to this as the dynasty's profile. Such a profile can be built for any ruling family and will uniquely belong to that family which will always be identifiable by this profile. We construct a similar graph for the second dynasty. Now the resulting graphs can be compared. If the profiles of two dynasties differ little from one another, then they depict the same real dynasty. This Fomenko’s method is based on the principle of “small distortions”. The mathematician calculated that although the chroniclers sometimes made mistakes in the duration of the reign of kings, these mistakes were not significant. Consequently, the profiles obtained on the basis of chronicles can be considered very individual. From birth, every person has attributes that distinguish them from all other people on the planet. They distinguish him not only from contemporaries, but also from those who have lived or will live. How to determine whether the same person is depicted in three

photographs or they are completely different people? The names are different, the biographies are different, the documents are also different. Physical resemblance? One can, however, change their appearance, dye hair, stick a mustache and beard, and even get plastic surgery. But DNA and fingerprints cannot be changed, they are individual and unique. Therefore, having a sufficient database, it is always possible to find out what kind of person is hiding behind a new appearance and a new name. The profile of a dynasty calculated by mathematicians is like fingerprints or human DNA. And if all of a sudden a new, allegedly unknown dynasty is discovered in some historical document, its profile can be recreated and compared with profiles from the database. This graphic depicts profiles of two ruling dynasties, the ancient Kingdom of Judah from the 6th – 1st century BC and the Eastern Roman Empire from the 4th –7 th centuries AD. And these are the profiles of the ruling dynasties of the Medieval Holy Roman Empire of the X – XIII centuries and the Medieval Habsburg Empire of the XIII – XVII centuries. If these profiles are placed on opposite sides of the axis, they are almost symmetrical. What happens? Do they belong to the same dynasty? Visual similarity should be verified. To do this, the probability of coincidence of these pairs of dynasties can be calculated. It turns out that it is negligible. There is about one chance in a hundred billion that two different dynasties of kings in two different countries were as similar to each other as two peas. In the official history, there were quite a few of such dynastic twins. Pairs of dynasties were discovered that are now considered completely different and which ruled in different countries during different eras. Say, one dynasty ruled in Ancient Rome, while another ruled in Medieval Europe. Nevertheless, our method unexpectedly showed that the reign graphs of these dynasties were strikingly similar, as close as knowingly dependent pairs of dynasties. We referred to such pairs as duplicates or phantoms. There were quite a few of them, several dozen. This method demonstrated that some ruling dynasties were merely reproduced in history, reproduced only on paper. How could this happen? Most likely for two reasons. Firstly, mistakes could have occurred due to the lack of consideration caused by the poor development of science at that time. For example, ancient documents described the same dynasty, and the interpreters of these texts concluded that they were referring to completely different rulers. Therefore, they gave them new names and transferred them not only to other countries but also to other eras. Secondly, and more importantly, such errors were deliberate. It was important for some powerful forces of the Middle Ages to re-write history, hiding something very important for their descendants and other peoples. We will discuss this in detail in the following parts. The discovery of duplicates of the dynasty of rulers leads to new thoughts. Most likely, not all chronicles that have come down to us have set out the events in the exact chronological order in which they actually occurred. The chronicler, when describing the events, necessarily mentions the kings and significant people of his era. It is their character and actions that interest him most. It is very important for the chronicler that nothing gets mixed up, and so he tries to describe his heroes as accurately as possible. Each person has a separate name. These names of historical characters are the best guide when analyzing a text. A personal diary can tell a lot about its owner. Here, for example, are the records of the boy Petya. He went to school and was friends with Vanya and Masha. The names of Vanya and Masha are found literally on every page and more than once. Gradually, records about them become less and less frequent. And it's understandable why. Petya graduated from high school and entered the university. He has a different life and new friends. He sees Vanya and Masha much less often, and towards the end of the notebook their names completely disappear. This is also understandable. Petya graduated from the university, started working, got a family and no longer cares about his school friends. The same logic holds true for chronicles. Each new generation gives birth to new heroes. Therefore, as the chronicler describing generations moves from one to another, he also changes characters in his narrative. This simple principle proved useful for creating a dating method. To check whether the chronological order of events in the annals is not violated, we will construct a graph. On the horizontal axis, we mark the sequence of parts of the text, and on the vertical axis, we indicate the number of all messages about all historical figures first mentioned in some part of the annals. If the

events are described in the correct chronological order, the graph will decline, looking something like this. Such a graph can be plotted for each part of the chronicle and for each character mentioned in it. For this principle Anatoly Fomenko coined the term “Frequency Damping principle”, and the associated method is the “Method for ordering historical texts chronologically”. Repeated tests on historical documents of the 17th – 20th centuries fully confirmed it. So, the history of this epoch is really the way everyone knows it. But as soon as we turn to earlier chronicles, incredible things begin. The graphs of ancient chronicles, constructed using Fomenko’s method, very often give an angled line with unexpected bursts instead of a decreasing curve. That is, the names of long-forgotten historical characters appear with the same frequency. And this is not historical nonsense. These are parts of the chronicle, transferred from the present to the past. If you return them to their correct place, the graph of the text will take on the correct form, a curve going down. If the last pages of Petya's diary only tell of long-forgotten school friends, what does this mean? Has Petya suddenly forgotten everyone around him? Does he no longer communicate with college friends and work colleagues, does not make new acquaintances, and is there only Vanya and Masha in his life? It's hard to believe. Most likely, this page simply fell out of the beginning of the diary and inadvertently ended up at the end of the notebook. The examples we have described clearly show how the pages of human history are mixed up. The chronology of this history is not just broken somewhere. As it turns out, it requires a total and careful review. What needs to be done to see all the contradictions of the generally accepted historical version? Perhaps it is necessary to compile a global chronological map of the entire traditional history? At first glance, this seems impossible, but, nevertheless, this task turned out to be feasible. Anatoly Timofeevich Fomenko decided to figure out how world history really looks like. To do this, he did a colossal job, studied hundreds of ancient texts, tables, annals, chronicles, analyzed the ancient and medieval history of Europe, Egypt, the Middle East, the Mediterranean. He studied most of the documents that describe the main events of human history that took place over a period of six thousand years, from the year 4000 BC to 1900 AD. To present this information visually, Anatoly Fomenko compiled a document which had no analogues yet. The scientist worked on it for six years. He depicted all the collected information in the form of a large chronological scale stretched along the horizontal time axis. It indicated exactly the dates that Scaliger and Petavius, the founders of the traditional history, insisted on. First, the map was displayed on graph paper, then it was scanned and the image was transferred onto a special material. This unique document is extraordinary in its size. The map is 19 meters long. Thus, for the first time, a graphic representation of history that is studied in schools and universities was created. Tens of thousands of names, many thousands of dates, information about civil unrests, important books, primary sources, chronicles, their dating, the authors of the chronicle, chroniclers, astronomers, etc. were depicted on the map in their due places. Then techniques developed by me and my colleagues, which I spoke about briefly, were applied to this material. And I marked duplicates on this map, that is, those epochs that turned out to be close, similar, dependent according to these methods. How was it done? Anatoly Fomenko divided the entire world history into epochs. Then each epoch was displayed in detail on the timeline. Events that took place simultaneously in different countries were depicted one above the other. To demonstrate multiple repetitions of historical events that exist in traditional history, Fomenko assigned different letters to different time intervals. For example, the era of the Second Rome was marked with the letter K. All of its duplicates, which Fomenko discovered using his methods, were marked with the same letter. Other historical eras, as well as their duplicates, were indicated by other letters, such as S and P, and were also marked on the map. Thus, a scheme showing how repetitions of historical events are located on the timeline took shape. This map was referred to as the "Global Chronological Map". It is this map that shows what the true chronology of historical events should be. It became apparent that there were three major chronological shifts in traditional history: roughly 300, 1000 and 1800 years. Many real historical events from the Middle Ages were multiplied on paper by medieval chroniclers and sent to the past. How could this have happened if

the chroniclers of the Middle Ages made a mistake unintentionally? Let’s take four ancient chronicles. They all describe the same events that took place, for example, in Europe in the 15th century. However, the fact remains that the authors of these chronicles lived not only in different countries, but even at different times. They spoke and wrote in different languages, used different chronologies. It is not surprising that, narrating about the same king, city or battle, they gave them completely different names. Therefore, when the chroniclers of the 16th – 18th centuries read these chronicles, they decided that it was about four totally distinct eras. Instead of placing these chronicles on the timeline one above the other, they arranged them sequentially; that is, one after the other. They left one chronicle in the 15th century; the second was pushed back 300 years, the third back 1000 years, and the fourth was sent back 1800 years. They stitched all them together, and a very long chronology was created. Only with the help of the method of statistical mathematics one can truly objectively analyze old texts. Without them, unfortunately, it is impossible to construct a chronology. Therefore, no true chronology had been created before us. It was based on very subjective interpretation of methods. Until the methods of mathematics and statistical astronomy are fully integrated into history, until then history will remain a science that is purely subjective and built on a very shaky foundation. We can say that today the project "New Chronology of Fomenko-Nosovsky" consists of two parts. The first part is the new mathematical methods for studying old texts and maps, as well as a chronological map compiled for the first time, the “New Chronological Map”. This map was created on the basis of a cross-checking of ancient historical texts and maps using all developed methods. The second part is a presumed reconstruction of history based on the new chronology. Having restored the real chronology, mathematicians Anatoly Fomenko and Gleb Nosovsky realized that it was necessary to recreate the entire world history, as traditional history was based on an incorrect chronology. Fomenko was supported by other renowned scientists. His research began to attract attention of colleagues not only in Russia but also abroad. In Germany, such studies were carried out by Evgeny Gabovich, a mathematician, historian, and writer. His works on historical analytics essentially develop the theory of Anatoly Fomenko. When I talk about the Russian New Chronology, well, we often call it the New Chronology of Fomenko and Nosovsky; I use the term “chronological revolution”. And I have high expectations that the history of philological, traditional, ideological and other lies about the past, which do not describe the past, but at best describe some kind of virtual past, can eventually turn into a kind of science about the past, which I urge you to call pastology. Alexander Alexandrovich Zinoviev is an outstanding Russian philosopher and writer, a professional logician. Having studied the works of Fomenko and Nosovsky, he immediately became their supporter. When I got acquainted with the book of Fomenko and Nosovsky, I was simply shocked, I must tell you, simply shocked. I was shocked, I was delighted, I literally walked for several days under the impression of this work, and for the first time in my life I had to face a truly great scientific discovery, and I experienced pleasure. I think that Anatoly Timofeevich is the most brilliant scientist; it is indisputable, and he is one of the brightest figures of the XX – XXI centuries, one of the outstanding figures, comparable only to Giordano Bruno, Galileo and so on. At the same time, both Newton and Morozov were obviously engaged in chronology, New chronology or real chronology, but it was certainly him who presented the system analysis, scientific, methodological, mathematical calculation. The results of the work of mathematicians Fomenko and Nosovsky are astounding. New methods have helped to find answers to questions that historians still consider unsolvable. With their help, it was possible to discover historical facts that were previously unknown. For example, it turned out that Russian history had been drastically altered. If the European and Asian chronology were artificially lengthened, then the Russian one, on the contrary, was shortened and significantly distorted. Fomenko's methods made it possible to establish that many very famous historical figures did not actually exist. It turned out that they were only historical doubles; phantoms of other real historical figures. It is sad to admit, but it turns out that for many years humanity has been dealing with a great historical hoax. All events allegedly taking place before the 10th century AD were phantom reflections of the actual

events of the Middle Ages, that is, the 11th – 17th centuries AD. They were incorrectly dated and passed off as being the real history of mankind. Therefore, the work of the authors of the New Chronology project is of great scientific importance. I believe that this discovery is one of the greatest discoveries of the 20th century. And if we take the sphere of historical research, then this is the most significant discovery in the entire process of understanding mankind's past. In the following parts of the series “History: Science or Fiction?” we will detail how the true history of mankind looks like, according to Anatoly Fomenko and Gleb Nosovsky. The picture turned out to be astounding, unexpected and even shocking to some. Ancient civilizations left us not only many historical monuments, but also many mysteries. One of them is the mystery of the Egyptian pyramids. How were these majestic structures built? How did ancient architects process and move huge stone blocks? Is the mystery of Ancient Egypt still unsolved?

## Alchemy of the Pyramids

The mysteries of ancient Egypt have been at the center of scientists' attention for several centuries. Among the many cultural architectural monuments left by the lost civilization, the most famous certainly are the three giant pyramids located on the stone plateau of Giza, near Cairo. Who, when and why built these cyclopean tetrahedra? It would seem that academic science has long answered these questions. Perhaps the only unresolved problem is the answer to the question of how they were built, or rather, how the ancient architects processed and moved huge stone blocks. Numerous technical solutions are offered in a variety of ways, but each of them contains many weaknesses, and all attempts by researchers to test the theory in practice have ended unsuccessfully. Meanwhile, in the latter half of the 20th century, chemical engineers made a discovery that provided a clue to the technology used to construct pyramids. Moreover, an independent examination of samples of building stone fully confirmed the scientists' correctness. The mystery of the ancient pyramids has been solved. It seems that this discovery should have been sensational, and the scientists who made it could have claimed the most prestigious scientific awards. However, things turned out differently. The scientific world answered with complete silence. Egyptologists did not seem to take notice of the discovery, and they still do not want to notice it. For historians, archaeologists, art historians, and just for tourists, Egypt can be considered one of the most bountiful places on the planet. Huge stone sculptures, the ruins of ancient temples, and mysterious hieroglyphs on the walls of palaces have been exciting the imaginations of researchers for hundreds of years. However, the main attraction in Egypt is the pyramids. There are over 80 of them. They stretch along the Nile River for a chain of 50 kilometers. This ensemble is dominated by monumental structures on the Giza Plateau near Cairo. The Pyramids of Cheops, Khafre, and Menkaure were known as the Great Pyramids and were included in the list of the so-called Seven Wonders of the World. And for good reason! The height of the largest of them, the Pyramid of Cheops, exceeds 140 meters. It consists of more than two million stone blocks, each weighing between 2.5 and 15 tons. Indeed, it is difficult to surprise a modern person with anything, even with the Great Pyramids. And yet, the question of how people were able to build such a thing many centuries ago still keeps scientists awake today. Egyptologists have proposed many techniques for constructing these colossi and have periodically tried to put them into practice. There have been numerous such attempts. The Americans and the Japanese have tried. Such attempts can be divided into several groups. The first category of attempts deals with the manufacturing of some wooden mechanisms, as well as various huge pulleys. The ancient slaves

allegedly entwined huge blocks with a network of ropes and cables, lifted them, loaded them onto sled with skids, and then dragged them for tens of kilometers. However, the researchers quickly became convinced that, from a technical point of view, all these theories are, to put it mildly, controversial. All attempts to construct, even diminished and highly simplified replicas of ancient structures utilizing this technology, always failed. Although the ancient builders of the pyramids dealt not only with relatively small blocks weighing several tons, but also with real colossi amounting to 500 tons. For example, the famous Temple of the Sphinx at Giza is made of such imposing bricks. It is difficult to imagine that the Egyptians could even move this block from its place, let alone transport it, according to Egyptologists, for tens and hundreds of kilometers! And here lies a giant block not far from the pyramid of Khafre. The well-known Egyptologist Jean-Philippe Lauer suggests in his book “Mysteries of the Egyptian Pyramids” that huge stone blocks were moved on wheels. However, this proposal is also highly questionable. Even today, transporting stone blocks of 500 tons would be an extremely difficult technical challenge. After all, what prevented the ancient Egyptians from dividing them into several parts to make their job easier? Indeed, as historians assure, blocks of various sizes were successfully cut in the quarries of ancient Egypt. A similarly difficult question is how these multi-ton bricks were raised? In his book, Jean-Philippe Lauer criticizes one lifting technique of these blocks by means of wooden mechanisms, and defends another; the construction of earth ramps next to the pyramids along the slopes of which heavy blocks were allegedly dragged. But in Alberto Carlo Capiceci's book “Art and history of Egypt. 5000 years of civilization” the technique of using wooden mechanisms has been described as the most plausible and tenable. There is also a theory that the pyramids were not built from the bottom up, but from the top down. At first, they were cut out of solid rock, and then lined with stone blocks. Even though the proposed methods of construction are theoretically feasible, firstly, they are incredibly time-consuming, and besides, they cannot answer all the questions. Some ancient Egyptian architectural puzzles remain unsolved. All the stone blocks in the walls of the pyramids, both the small ones and the largest, are almost perfectly fitted to each other. The gap between some of them is not more than half a millimeter. Here, as with the pyramid of Cheops, we see the perfect fit of granite blocks; moreover, they are large blocks. They converge at perfectly right angles, and the seams between them are so tight that not even a needle can be inserted into them. To achieve such a result, diligence alone is clearly not enough. Special tools are needed and unique, even by modern standards, stone processing technologies. How could the Egyptians make such a fit? Representatives of the scientific world only shrug their shoulders and continue to talk about the mysterious greatness of the ancient Egyptian civilization. And in some cases, it's ridiculous. For example, I noticed that in the Sphinx temple one of the inner corners was not made by joining two blocks, as is usually done in stone construction, but by making a corner in the block itself. That is, the block has an L-shaped section, slightly bends five centimeters to the next wall. Imagine what it means to make such a stepped block. This means that one needs to remove the surface of this entire block, deepening it by five centimeters. The idea is completely crazy, and it does not fit into the framework of common stone construction. There is one more question. Why did the ancient architects complicate an already difficult task for themselves? I must say that the authors of these theories themselves understand all their inconsistencies. That is why, in serious scientific books, you can find, in our opinion, a completely frivolous statement that the ancients had almost semi-mystical means that have since been lost, which enabled them to make huge stones rise into the air and move by themselves in space. This already belongs to the realm of fantasy, but I reiterate: these

words are heard because the authors of the theory understand that, unfortunately, they can offer nothing more reasonable. In such a situation, it can be assumed that some highly developed civilizations, for example, the inhabitants of the legendary Atlantis or even aliens, had a hand in the creation of huge structures. What if the question was phrased differently? It would still be no less paradoxical at first glance. If the ancient architects were not able to carve and heap huge stone blocks on top of each other, then how could they still build the Great Pyramids? Could they have used some other construction technology? How to build a structure of this magnitude today, skyscrapers, for example? Obviously using concrete. If the pyramids were built today, then the main building material would most likely be concrete. In appearance, the blocks of the Egyptian pyramids could pass for concrete, but the production of this building material involves the use of very sophisticated modern technologies. For example, take the manufacturing of cement, which is the main component of concrete. At the first stage, the rock is ground with the addition of water and turns into a liquid mass. Further, this mass is subjected to gradual heating in special furnaces, and complex physicochemical transformations take place in it. After rapid cooling, a semi-finished product known as clinker is obtained and then ground again. The problem is that the firing stage requires a temperature of approximately 1,500 degrees Celsius. Only under such conditions does the material acquire the necessary properties. It is unlikely that the ancient Egyptians had such furnaces, and therefore such concrete. On the other hand, since ancient times, mankind has used something similar to concrete or cement for construction with stone and brick. People have long understood that stones cannot stand well on their own; they must be bonded either with cement, or with lime, or with egg yolk and protein. They hold very tightly. At different times in different countries, wax, resin, wheat flour, sheep's cheese and garlic juice were used in the manufacturing of cement mortar. Can such ingredients be used on an industrial scale, not just for bonding blocks, but for manufacturing them? Millions of blocks! So, is concrete still being considered, or has it been taken off the table? The French chemist and professor at the University of Bern, Joseph Davidovi'ts, developed a method for obtaining this geopolymer concrete in the middle of the 20th century. This production does not require the use of complex, modern technologies. Any crushed rock can be used for its manufacture. Concrete hardens quickly at room temperature and turns into an artificial stone. Currently, this technology is successfully being used by American and European manufacturers. The strong point of Davidovi'ts' discovery is that, to create an artificial stone, he proposed using a long-known physical phenomenon – adhesion. Adhesion, from the Latin adhaesio, is the tendency of dissimilar liquid or solid particles or surfaces to cling to one another at their points of contact. Davidovi'ts suggested that his discovery could have been known to ancient architects, including the builders of the Egyptian pyramids. It was Davidovi'ts who put forward a bold hypothesis that the pyramids and other famous structures in Egypt were not at all carved from stone, but were made from concrete. To make geopolymer concrete, neither high temperatures, nor high pressures, nor modern technologies are needed. All that is needed is to know the exact ratios of the chemicals that are mixed into the composition. Joseph Davidovi'ts identified 13 components of the building material of the ancient Egyptians. It turned out that all of them were literally lying under the feet of the builders. For example, sodium carbonate is available in large quantities in local deserts and salt flats, and mud from the Nile River contains alumina. Even now, people are sitting in Cairo on the shore made from the Nile silt, which is not just clay, but a mixture of hydroxides of iron, aluminum, and other substances, including organics, which turn to stone when dried to a hard, stone state. This is an excellent binder. Look, they made a wall. This is not a baked brick made from

Nile silt or just from earth. A binder is necessary to obtain an artificial stone from hard rocks, such as granite or diorite. But one can manage without any gluing; soft rocks can be ground into a very fine powder with little difficulty. Take any rock, crush it to a certain size, and then mix it with the same, finer powder and mix it with ordinary water, and you will get a stone that is practically indistinguishable from natural stone. So, we can conclude that there were all the conditions necessary for the production of concrete in ancient Egypt. By the way, there is a rather curious ancient Egyptian image on the wall of Rekhmire's tomb in the Valley of the Nobles . It can be reasonably interpreted as a step-by-step description of the process of making concrete blocks. Here are two Egyptians using jugs to collect water from a square reservoir; the third is crushing rock; the next is making a batch, and the resulting mass is being loaded into a basket. Next comes the pouring of a huge block. In fact, this is not natural stone, but geopolymer concrete, and on the outside it was coated with a layer of a higher-quality composition, well, at least a composition that was slightly different from the composition of the internal one. Because of this, there was a non-heterogeneity along the surface and the skin peels off. Let's see what is underneath this skin. Sand. It can be seen that there is sand here. It is not granite. This is geopolymer concrete. Let us now recall the main mysteries of the pyramids and see if they can be explained using this concrete technique. The ancient Greek scientist Herodotus, often called "The Father of History", after traveling to Egypt and communicating with local priests, created a new interpretation of pyramid construction technologies. Here is what he wrote: "When this, its first form, was completed, the workmen used short wooden logs as levers to raise the rest of the stones; they heaved up the blocks from the ground onto the first tier of steps. When the stone had been raised, it was set on another lever that stood on the first tier, and the lever again used to lift it from this tier to the next. It may be that there was a new lever on each tier of steps, or perhaps there was only one lever, quite portable, which they carried up to each tier in turn." That is a pretty vague description. What kind of levers was it and how was it raised? But in any case, is it conceivable to lift multi-ton stone blocks with the help of wooden levers? Egyptologists declared without a shadow of a doubt that Herodotus' version was erroneous. However, if we assume that we are discussing geopolymer concrete, then we have a completely plausible description of a form into which the concrete mix was poured. That is the most common construction formwork. Formwork is a removable wooden or metal mold used to form concrete into structural shape of a future concrete or reinforced concrete construction. If you carefully read this text, it becomes clear that Herodotus describes precisely the wooden formwork, with the help of which the stone was lifted, and in a sense the stone grew. Because it is clear that if a huge volume of this cement is poured at once, it will dry either unevenly, or it will be distorted. It is clear that these stones are built up. That is, layer by layer, letting it dry. These layers are clearly visible today where the stone blocks are exposed. If it were natural limestone, for example, as in the wall of the Cairo fortress, then the layers would have to be even and parallel. Limestone is a sedimentary rock. Its layered structure is formed as a result of the sedimentation on the ocean floor of various substances, which gradually build up parallel layers millimeter by millimeter. But in the blocks of the pyramids and temples, a completely different pattern is visible. Here is a fragment of the Cheops pyramid block. This is a chip in the upper corner of the block. On the side surface of the block, a mesh pattern is clearly visible. Where did it come from? There is a simple explanation. This is a mat imprint, which was laid inside the formwork where the block was cast. Moreover, as if there was one mat from left to right, and the other overlapped it, from right to left in two layers. This is possible only if it was part of the formwork, the mat that covered the formwork. But the

upper surface of the block is pretty uneven and bumpy. This is exactly how concrete should set. Today, to avoid such defects, special vibrators are used, but it is unlikely that the ancient builders would have anything like that. If all this had been carved out of stone, then, certainly, the surface of the block would have been treated to all look the same way, and it would have had a uniform character. The formwork traces mean that we are dealing with concrete. The question arises why no one pays attention to these patterns? Because in the lower masonry of the pyramid, which tourists usually pass by, there are no such marks. But if you climb higher... This fragment of the pyramid block was taken from a height of more than 50 meters. There, similar traces are visible on all blocks. Obviously, it can be assumed that the ancient Egyptians processed stones differently for different levels of construction. But there is another explanation as well. Pyramid blocks are quite soft; their hardness can be compared to the hardness of gypsum or a human nail. So, the sandstorms frequent in these places could well have polished off the surface of the blocks and destroyed all traces in during a long time period. Sand rushes to the pyramids and plays the role of an abrasive block. It rises to a maximum of several tens of meters, 20-30-50 meters. And traces of formwork were found higher than that. By the way, traces of mats can be seen not only on the blocks of the pyramids. We are in the courtyard of the temple of Esna. Here is a stone bearing clear traces of concrete origin. Remains of a reed mat frozen into stone. Now let's try to solve another mystery. When building pyramids and temples, how did the Egyptians process blocks so that the gap between them was minimal? In many places, these gaps seem to be just regular scratches on the surface of the stone. Egyptologists cannot give a clear explanation for this phenomenon; they just calmly admire it. Well, it is really difficult to imagine how the Egyptians smoothed out multi-ton stone blocks. In addition, before fitting the blocks to each other, they must be cut from solid pieces of rock. According to Egyptologists, they did it with copper saws. Has anyone ever cut a wood with an ordinary steel spring set saw? Sure. Has it ever gone without saw damage to wood? Never. The saw always pops out of a groove. Are there such damages on the stones of the pyramid of Cheops? No. Nobody has ever seen it anywhere. Further. Why do we set saws? That is, why do we bend away saw teeth? To allow the blade moving without binding (getting stuck). And how do you saw with a copper strip without binding in the stone? It will get stuck right away. By the way, did anyone ever see these saws anywhere in any museum? There are none. But if the blocks were not carved, but molded, then everything falls into place. Each next block was formed by adding a wooden formwork to an already finished block. You grout a new portion of concrete and water, and then these two blocks literally merge with each other. In principle, the ancient builders could have made the walls monolithic, but in this case, the pyramids would sooner or later burst and collapse under the influence of various temperature drops and internal structural stress. In order for the structure, as they say, to breathe, it was apparently divided into separate bricks. So, the pyramids still stand today. In their centuries-old walls you will not see a single crack. But one can find quite unexpected things. For example, in the masonry of one of the satellite pyramids, located south of the Pyramid of Menkaure in Giza, rather strange cavities immediately catch the eye. This pyramid is made up of blocks that are covered with a hard crust, but the internal composition is much softer. This is not the case for natural stones. But for concrete blocks, this is normal, because in order to make a block, they could use a cheaper compound for the inner block and a more expensive and stronger one for its exterior. It can be broken by hand, just by hand. This is inside the hollow; this is the internal composition of the stone. If we try to damage this crust, the external composition, then no chance, it is out of question to break with your hands. Inside the stone is quite soft and easily

crumbles with a finger, and on the outside, there is a hard porous crust, hardly yielding even to a knife blade. Can a natural stone have a hard coating and a soft interior, moreover, the stone processed, sawn or cut in a quarry? In our opinion, no, it is out of the question. But if it is concrete, then, obviously, substances that give it increased strength could well have been added to the surface layer of concrete. And again, the question arises, why did others not see this? They were taught that limestone blocks were cut out on the other side of the Nile River and then they were transported on barges, on rafts to this side. The limestone over there is different. In that limestone there are a lot of perfectly preserved nummulites, these shells the size of a small coin. And in the blocks of the pyramid of Cheops, where are these very same nummulites? Where are the organic remains, sea hedgehog of the Eocene Epoch? There are none. Moreover, any limestone cracks. I had a hard time finding a crack while wandering around the pyramid of Cheops, because concrete is amorphous; concrete does not form cracks and behaves like a substance with the same density and structure in all directions. In the pyramid of Cheops there is a monolithic granite sarcophagus. But no one can answer the question of how it got there. It could not be carried through the existing passages and doors of the pyramid; they are much narrower. Think of other mysteries of this kind. For example, in the famous Valley of the Kings, located 500 kilometers from Cairo, not far from the city of Luxor. Today, a wide road leads there; even a car can go there. However, a hundred years ago there was no road. The valley where the pharaohs were buried was surrounded by sheer cliffs all around it. And to get inside, one had to go through a narrow hole cut in the rock. When the first French conquerors, headed by Napoleon, got into the valley, they were amazed to find granite sarcophagi in the tombs of the pharaohs. Their dimensions significantly exceeded the dimensions of the only entrance to the valley. Moreover, these sarcophagi, as in the pyramid of Cheops, were not assembled, not glued from separate parts, but monolithic, because being hit by a hammer they rang like a bell. The Egyptologists said, well, they were dragged over the mountains, lowered with some kind of ropes. Wouldn't it be easier to widen the entrance to the valley a bit? Because it was not a problem to widen it, there rocks over there are soft. If you really need to drag such a sarcophagus, why drag it through the mountains? This, by the way, still needs to be proved that this is possible, because such sarcophagi weigh a lot. If we assume that the sarcophagi were not moved anywhere, but were made in the valley itself from geopolymer granite concrete, then this mystery also gets a completely rational explanation. The method of geopolymerization allows creating not only artificial limestone. Concrete can be made from any other rock, such as granite or even superhard diorite. Joseph Davidovi'ts suggested that the pyramid blocks are not the only ancient Egyptian concrete product. Imitation of natural materials could be used everywhere in the creation of temples, statues, household items. Another Egyptian puzzle with the famous amphorae found in the pyramid of Djoser gets solved in the same way. They are made from the hardest varieties of stone, in particular from diorite. Modern sculptors do not even try to use these types of stone. Some of them are harder than iron. The question is how such amphorae could be made by drilling. After all, Egyptologists tell us that it was drilled, that the ancient Egyptians took a block of stone, turned it on the outside to give it the shape of an amphora, and then somehow using copper tools or some kind of stone drilled, and drilled out a cavity inside. Firstly, it is still not clear with what it was drilled. This requires diamond drills. Even if such a drill is available, how does one drill an amphora through a narrow neck, so that the expansion at the bottom creates walls uniform in thickness. Moreover, neither the inner nor the outer surfaces of the amphorae have any traces of working with a hard tool. How much time and effort had to be spent to make the walls of these vessels not only

uniform in thickness, but also absolutely smooth? The Davidovi'ts' discovery completely solves this problem. Not yet hardened geopolymer concrete could be processed on a conventional potter's wheel, like ordinary clay. And this means that the ancient masters did not spend that much time on the manufacture of each product. There is yet another fact that many Egyptologists admire almost superstitiously. We are talking about the depth and clarity of hieroglyphs carved into the hardest rocks. There are no analogues to the ancient Egyptian method of creating images anywhere in the world. If we look at, say, European, Russian stone carving, which is done on soft stone, we will see that the stone is cut at different angles, a pattern appears, there are some recesses, bulges, edges, shadows of which form the image. Egyptian carving uses a completely different principle. The image evenly goes deep into the stone at a right angle. Even from modern hard alloys, it is not possible to create tools that would enter granite or diorite like a hot knife through butter. Meanwhile, the chisel in the hands of the ancient master seemed to meet no resistance and did not deviate to the side, even bumping into denser spots. Of course, here one can again embark on a discussion about the craftsmanship and determination of the Egyptian sculptors and once again be surprised at their strange tendency to complicate tasks. Indeed, why go deeper than 10 centimeters into the rock? Why not limit yourself to a modest two or three centimeters? The inscription will be perfectly readable. But, perhaps, in search of the most plausible explanation, instead of creating more and more myths about some hardworking miracle workers, it would be more productive to return to the idea of geopolymer concrete and assume that the hieroglyphs were not cut, but pressed into not yet hardened surface. Then it becomes clear how and with what the inscriptions were applied. The Egyptians are geniuses at plastering. The plaster they put on is perfect. The walls of temples, literally, are continuous plaster, on which all these hieroglyphs were made by extrusion. Often this cladding is mistaken for granite, but they do not understand how the inside of this cladding absolutely exactly, as if according to a template, coincides with the material to which it is glued. When plastering, this is usually typical. And in fact, if we forget that we are dealing with the mysterious incomprehensible art of stone processing, it immediately becomes obvious that one cannot do without plastering work here. On many ancient Egyptian granite stones, as well as statues, for example, sphinx ones, there are these bald spots, that is, the skin peels off from this statue parallel to the treated surface. Undoubtedly, the stone may be layered, but the layers of the stone cannot be parallel to the resulting finished surface of that stone. In order to make a huge granite sphinx, one doesn't need to waste high-quality concrete inside the sphinx. Finally, one more argument in favor of the concrete version. In the courtyard of the Dendera temple there is an ancient Egyptian granite slab. An image quite typical for Ancient Egypt is stamped in it. This slab consists of granite crystals which are fastened together with a gray powder. This granite can be simply broken by hand. Science has no knowledge of natural granite, which can be easily crumbled by hand. It seems that in this case we are dealing with an example of a manufacturing defect made by the ancient masters. The builders chose the binder so poorly that it practically crumbles under your hand. The Egyptians were people too and could very well be wrong sometimes. For example, when forming the composition of the concrete mass. In any case, artificial origin of the stone is obvious. It is necessary to clarify one more circumstance. How did the builders crush the rock? Why not assume that this problem was solved by analogy with the problem of grinding grain, where mortars, graters and millstones were used? There is no problem in this. Moreover, the graters in which rock could be ground were found in Egypt. Hand graters can grind limestone. But how to grind hard rocks such as diorite to a state of powder? It turns out there is a pretty simple way. We do this in the

field every year, when we need to get powder from the hardest rock, but so that there is no iron from sledgehammers or mortars. We just put one stone on top of another and hit it with a third stone. So, this way, stone on stone a powder is obtained. In this simple way you can get the initial material for the manufacture of objects from artificial stone of any hardness and in any quantity if beating for a long time, all the while finely crushing the entire stone is not necessary. A mixture of powder and small fragments is stronger and makes it possible to speed up production. In addition, the inhabitants of the Earth have used another very easy way of crushing since ancient times. In Yemen, people break grain while riding in a large stone bowl on a swing. In this way, it is possible to grind solid rock with stone on stone in large volumes, rather than in small graters. Thus, the hypothesis about the use of geopolymer concrete in ancient Egypt takes on a completely finished form and really explains most of the mysteries of the pyramids. And not only them. Baalbek in Lebanon, the English Stonehenge and other similar structures could well have been built in a similar way. But if geopolymer concrete has indeed been used by mankind since time immemorial, then how come the unique knowledge disappeared? The answer to this question is quite obvious. Previously, only a few discoveries became the subject of the public domain, the rest were kept in the strictest confidence. Only a few initiates could know the secret, and in the event of their sudden death, there was simply no one to pass on the secrets of mastery. This is how the technologies for the production of filigree and granulation, and damask steel were lost. But we still know a lot about them, or have at least heard something about them. But why do we not know anything about the unique building material used in the past? Is there really no historical mention of it? We all know the famous philosopher's stones of the Middle Ages. The alchemists of the 17th-18th-19th centuries were especially fond of searching for the philosopher's stone. Of course, the theme of the philosopher's stone itself is very extensive, very ambiguous, and many different storylines are clearly intertwined here. Traditional science considers alchemy to be a pseudoscientific direction in the development of conventional chemistry. Its accomplishments include the discovery or improvement of products of practical value, such as mineral vegetable dyes, glasses, enamels, metal alloys, acids, alkalis, and salts. But the main task of alchemy was to obtain the so-called philosopher's stone. According to popular belief, in the Middle Ages they were looking for nothing more than a substance capable of turning base metal into gold. And all real inventions are just by-products, randomly obtained in the course of this fruitless search. However, science could hardly have existed for many hundreds of years without giving any real return, based on fiction and empty promises. Obviously, alchemists also took on the solution of some practical problems. Moreover, those who financed them should have had good reason to believe that the goal was feasible, that it had already been done before. Meanwhile, in the history of alchemy, it is believed that the secret of the philosopher's stone was known in Egypt. The last person who possessed secret knowledge was a certain Roman named Marienus. The legend says that one day the Egyptian king Kalit gathered his alchemists and demanded to make the coveted stone. However, all their attempts ended in failure. Then Marienus came to the king and easily accomplished the task. The reward for the Roman was his life. All the other alchemists were executed. But Marienus fled, fearing that sooner or later the same sad fate might befall him. Many years later, one of the king's servants nevertheless tracked down the fugitive and asked him to reveal the secret. And Marienus answered his question. And revealed this secret and said that in order to create a stone, one must first destroy, and that it has several components. He called them by some strange words that his companion did not understand. Subsequently, the alchemists tried to interpret the words of Marienus, but apparently unsuccessfully,

since they never got the philosopher's stone. What if we assume that we are talking about the manufacture of geopolymer concrete? We are by no means declaring that the philosopher's stone is necessarily geopolymer concrete. No. But as one of the possibilities, it is quite probable. And from this point of view, many interpretations of old sources acquire a new clear meaning, which, as we found out, by referring to old books on alchemy, quite often and quite well reproduce the method of making geopolymer concrete. The technology is as follows. First one needs to grind the rock, then add special substances, then mix everything and, finaly, get the stone. By the way, today we call it artificial stone, and in the past, knowledge in general was considered and art, as well as philosophy. An artificial stone is obtained with the help of art with the help of knowledge. In other words, we can say, a philosopher's stone is a stone that is obtained with the help of philosophy with the help of some knowledge. And, certainly, such an important invention as geopolymer concrete from which it was possible to make sturdy fortress walls and certain structures, this discovery, obviously, was of the utmost importance. And therefore it is clear that after its loss they tried to stubbornly re-discover it for a very long time but the medieval alchemists did not succeed in the 17th century. They worked on it a lot in the 17th century and then they abandoned this business, and only in the 20th century it was re-discovered it. Evidently, the bold hypothesis of Davidovi'ts, Fomenko, Nosovsky and other scientists needs independent verification. And in order to reliably establish what kind of stone the pyramids are made of, natural or artificial, it is enough to conduct a physical-chemical analysis of it. And such an analysis was made by Russian scientists. In November 2005, the research group of the New Chronology project headed by Gleb Nosovsky visited Egypt. During the trip, new facts were discovered confirming the concrete version; many of which are reflected in this part. In addition, samples of the building material of one of the three great pyramids, the Pyramid of Menkaure, were selected. The base of the pyramid, about a third of its height, is lined with what is considered to be natural granite. A fragment of this cladding was provided by Gleb Nosovsky for research. “Here, we will collect it and submit for examination.” Indeed, the stone from which this cladding is made looks very similar to natural, and least of all resembles concrete. This makes it even more interesting to learn the results of the examination carried out at the Institute of Physical Chemistry and Electrochemistry of the Russian Academy of Sciences. The purpose of the research was to study the structure and elemental composition of the stone-like sample. The sample was prepared by the cleavage method, followed by the deposition of an electrically conductive element on its surface, which was carbon. Carbon was sputtered in a high vacuum while rotating the sample, which made it possible to obtain a thin carbon film on the sample surface. The sample prepared in this way was examined in a scanning electron microscope. This microscope is equipped with energy and wave X-ray detectors, which allow determining the content of elements with an accuracy of 1 tenth to 1 hundredth of a percent, depending on their chemical structure. As a result of the research, microphotographs of the sample surface were obtained at various levels of their structural organization, as well as X-ray spectra, which unambiguously made it possible to establish the elements that make up this sample, as well as their quantity and other substances. The results of chemical analysis showed that the percentage of titanium, calcium, sodium, phosphorus, sulfur, chlorine and aluminum is too high for natural granite. And vice versa, potassium and silica turned out to be in smaller amounts than in natural stone. How can this be explained? In appearance, this sample is very similar to a piece of granite. However, any experienced geologist, when looking at photographs taken with an electron microscope, will immediately make an unambiguous conclusion: this is not natural stone. Natural granite has a dense uniform granular structure. At the

same time, the gaps between the crystals of feldspars and micas are occupied by solid quartz. But in the sample taken from the pyramid of Menkaure, the pattern is completely different. The structure of the stone is quite loose; the grains of minerals are unevenly distributed and fastened with some kind of binder, which is absolutely not typical for natural stone. It is the presence of this binder composition that can explain the increased content of titanium, calcium, aluminum and other compounds in the sample. Overall, all this shows that we are dealing, most likely, with some kind of building mixture, with some kind of mortar. The base is calcareous or limestone, more precisely. And the additional materials that we see with our own eyes are either the composition of feldspar, or biotite, or just granite. These facts are already quite enough to draw a conclusion. The pyramid of Menkaure is lined with artificial material. But if you look closely at the photographs, you will find another more than convincing argument in favor of the concrete version. The presence of some hair-like aggregates and individual hairs, very thin, in large quantities, judging by the photographs, shows that this is a foreign material of organic origin, which has nothing to do with natural stone. And its introduction is possible only during the manufacture of this artificial building material. I suggested that it could be the fine wool of some ram, some sheep that lived there. But it's literally real felt when you look at it on a normal scale. Hair covered with keratin scales. They are visible surprisingly well. The amount of foreign material in this material of the pyramid is grandiose; there is so much of it that it's not even worth arguing about. Well, these results are not unexpected. Davidovi'ts carried out similar studies decades ago and came to the same conclusion. It is surprising that Egyptologists do not pay attention to such results, although they have long been informed about this. And Davidovi'ts spoke, and we write. And one gets the impression that Egyptologists stubbornly do not want to listen to the arguments of natural science representatives. In 1982, Jean-Philippe Lauer, a supporter of the stone version, gave Joseph Davidovi'ts two fragments of pyramid blocks and offered for him to prove their artificial origin. Chemical analysis, carried out at once in two independent laboratories, unconditionally confirmed the concrete version. On this occasion, Davidovi'ts made a presentation at the Congress of Egyptologists in Toronto, but Lauer, who also came to the forum, for some reason didn't show up for his colleague's speech. He limited himself to a short comment in the press: “not stupid, but impossible.” It cannot be, because it can never be. This is the answer of one scientist to another. Two years later, in 1984, Davidovi'ts appealed to the Egyptian Antiquities Organisation for permission to conduct research on the Pyramid field at Giza, but the professor's request was rejected. The reason for the refusal was explained as follows. “Your hypothesis is only a personal point of view, which does not correspond to archaeological and geological facts.” That is, the refusal was purely demagogic in nature; no scientific arguments were put forward against Davidovi'ts’ hypothesis. And in our opinion, this is a clear indication that, in fact, some Egyptologists seem to be aware that any start of a discussion on this topic is fraught with big problems. Here is another very recent example. In 2006, American scientists conducted an independent study of the substance that makes up the blocks of the Cheops pyramid. Spectral and mineral analysis showed that the building material sample consisted of a mixture of limestone, sand and clay. Experts have now come to the obvious conclusion that it is concrete. It seems that now nothing can shake the almost religious inertia of the conclusions of the representatives of traditional science. After all, Davidovi'ts did not just write books, he proved in practice the possibility of building a concrete pyramid from materials available to the ancient Egyptians. When you look at the stones of the pyramid, this is what you see. You see either smooth blocks or very crude blocks. And we have replicated all these surfaces just by varying amount of water, which depends on the

climate, depends on the weather. In this way Davidovi'ts tried to draw attention to his theory, but all was in vain. There is a feeling that modern Egyptologists are trying, by all means, to preserve the beautiful fairy tale created by their predecessors in the nineteenth century. A fairy tale how millions of Egyptian slaves for many decades, like ants, tossed huge stone blocks and erected colossal pyramids from them. Too much has been written about this in textbooks. Colorful films have been shot. Well, to admit now that all this is fiction? Historians don't want that. But in this case doubts about their correctness on other issues may arise. If a blunder is found on one of the pages of a scientific work, and its author, instead of admitting this error, stubbornly defends his accuracy, this is a clear indicator that there are a lot of errors in the work. Indeed, our analysis of the history and chronology of Egypt showed that the history and chronology of Egypt, which is defended by Egyptologists, rests on very shaky foundations and there are a lot of deep and fundamental mistakes in it. All history books state that the Egyptian civilization is very ancient and existed many thousands of years ago. But surprisingly, historians never had and still do not have any real evidence in support of this supposedly most obvious antiquity. So, the question of how the pyramids were built is by no means the only and far from the most fundamental one, where when answering the representatives of traditional science stubbornly adhere to the erroneous version. There are reasons to assert that the answers of academic science to other questions, when, who and why they built them, are not so well-founded, as it seems at first glance.

## Mystery Of The Egyptian Zodiacs

Ancient Egypt. The world of pharaohs, pyramids and sphinxes. A world of mystery that seems like it takes modern man into an unprecedented distance of time. Tourists from all over the world are drawn to Egypt in an endless stream to touch this mystery. Few of these people doubt the undeniable antiquity of this country. Since childhood, we have been sure that historians have evidence of Egypt's millennia-old past. But it turns out that not everything is so simple and obvious. It turns out that not all the information that has come down from the past of Egypt to our time has been deciphered and published. On the walls and vaults of Egyptian tombs and temples, which tourists love to visit, unique images created by skillful artists and astronomers of antiquity have been preserved. These are the zodiacs. Unfortunately, the majority of visitors to these places do not know anything about them. Moreover, today it is almost impossible to find a publication of a complete image of one or another Egyptian zodiac. At best, you can find photographs of individual fragments. Attempting to take your own detailed photographs of the zodiac in an Egyptian tomb can cause serious problems with local security. Let's try to figure out what is encrypted in these ancient images and why they are so carefully guarded. It is believed that modern science knows a lot, if not everything, about Egypt. According to the official version, ancient Egypt is one of the earliest states in the history of mankind. It arose on the African continent around the beginning of the fourth millennium BC and lasted until the first century AD. It is believed that the heyday of Egypt lasted from 2700 to 2200 BC. Not much is known about the ancient Egyptians: that they lived under the rule of the pharaohs, who were worshiped as deities, believed in afterlife and mummified bodies of deceased rulers. The mummies of the pharaohs were placed in luxurious and fantastic for their time tombs, the halls of which were decorated with murals and picturesque inscriptions. According to

Egyptologists, the last burials were made no later than the first centuries of the Common era. This is the official chronology of Egypt. This is how most people in all countries imagine Egyptian history. But where did all this information come from? How do we know what happened thousands of years ago? By whom and when was the antiquity of Egypt established? First, it's worth figuring out when in Europe they even learned about this country. This is a rather important point of our investigation. After all, until the end of the 18th century, Europeans knew very little about Egypt. Here is the evidence. In a rather voluminous chronograph of the late 17th century, only a couple of pages are devoted to Egyptian history. It can be seen from the text that the knowledge of the Europeans is scarce, fragmented and rather vague. But everything changes after the victorious campaign of Napoleon Bonaparte in Egypt in 1798-1801. In this military campaign, the French army was accompanied by artists and scientists. Artists sketched Egyptian monuments, and scientists collected cultural and household items and tried to systematize them. The so-called Napoleon's Description was compiled from the drawings and the result of the work of scientists was the multi-volume series of publications "Description of Egypt", appearing in Europe at the beginning of the 19th century. These were the first steps of a completely new European science, Egyptology, and the first attempts to date the discovered Egyptian monuments. None the less, how was antiquity of Egypt determined? At the beginning of the 19th century, the French philologist Jean-François Champollion deciphered the hieroglyphic writing on the Rosetta stone brought to France from that very same Napoleonic campaign. On a granite slab found by the French near the Egyptian town of Rosetta, texts were engraved in three languages: hieroglyphs, Egyptian Demotic script and Ancient Greek. The scientist assumed that the texts were identical, compared them, and thus deciphered the Egyptian hieroglyphs. However, it is known that long before Champollion, hieroglyphs were read and understood in Europe. What is strange is it turns out that one could read Christian texts and even entire fragments from the Bible written in hieroglyphic inscriptions. But this fundamentally contradicted the Scaligerian chronology. And then these early translations were declared wrong. And today it is Champollion who is famous as the author of the first grammar and the first dictionary of the ancient Egyptian language. He was also one of the first to declare that the history of Egypt began several millennia BC. But on what basis? Having discovered in the 19th century long lists of some Egyptian names, he immediately decided that these were the names of pharaohs, not high-ranking dignitaries, not just rich famous people, but rulers. These lists were incomplete. There was very little specific information about the reign of a particular dynasty. Therefore, it was extremely difficult to establish the duration of the reign of one or another pharaoh. But Egyptologists found a way out. For example, the famous 19th-century German Egyptologist Heinrich Brugsch did this. For reasons he did not substantiate, he decided to assign about 33 and one third of a year per pharaoh, based on about three pharaohs per century. And thus, counting the number of pharaohs, and deciding that every three pharaohs give us one century, he moved into the past, thereby counting dates of the old dynasties, of which now there are about 20. All other Egyptologists agreed with this principle of constructing Egyptian history. At that time, the chronology of the 16th-century French scientist Joseph Scaliger had already been accepted. According to this chronology, the history of Egypt had several thousand years. And this version was considered quite reasonable. Therefore, in the 19th century, such an Egyptian chronology fit perfectly into the Scaliger's world chronology, ostensibly confirming it. Note that today, after a couple of centuries, the incredibly long history of Egypt does not raise any questions at all. But this chronology looks very strange, since there are no justifications for such math. And the analysis that

we have undertaken shows that the average duration of reigns for rulers of the ancient world is by no means 33 and 1/3 years, but somewhere around 17 years. And even then it varies for different regions. Thus, the following conclusion can be drawn. Both the chronology of Egypt and Egyptology itself are not based on rigorous scientific research, but on the conjectures of the 19th century Egyptologists: Champollion, Brugsch and others. Meanwhile, they had opportunity to establish the true chronology of Egypt. After all, the bygone generations of the Egyptians left special signs for their descendants, in which they encrypted the exact dates associated with the history of Egypt. The walls of many Egyptian tombs are decorated with rather large paintings, in which, it is thought, symbolic images of the zodiac constellations are depicted. Similar drawings can be seen under the vaults of temples, and on the covers of some sarcophagi. These pictures of the nighttime sky are called zodiacs. What is a zodiac? Here is the belt-shaped region of the sky, that is, a circle of 12 zodiac constellations. Aries, Taurus, Gemini and so on. All planets move in this circle, as well as the Moon. The sun is also always in this circle. The circle resembles a clock. The zodiac belt is the clock dial. The planets serve as hands that move relative to the constellations. If at a certain hour of the day you sketch the position of the hands on an ordinary clock, it will be clear to everyone what time is indicated in the picture. The same thing happens with the “astral clock”. The planets are constantly moving. Every day one can observe a new position of the planets relative to the zodiac constellations, the Sun and the Moon. This means that each day has its own astral time on this clock. Astronomers call this time “the date of the horoscope”. And if today you depict the location of planets visible in the sky, you can be sure that after many years scientists will be able to decipher what day we are talking about. The zodiacal location of the planets, the Sun and the Moon is indicated with symbols. The specific position of the planets determines the specific date. Obviously, when creating a zodiac, the Egyptians wanted to preserve for posterity a date related to a particular construction or important event. This is one of the most famous Egyptian zodiacs, the zodiac from the Dendera Temple complex. It was discovered by Europeans in 1799 and taken to Paris. The real zodiac is still in the Louvre. And a replica was placed in the Dendera temple. The replica is quite accurate, although more fine-looking than the original. Because of its shape, this zodiac is often called the Round Dendera zodiac. There are many figures here. Among them you can see familiar symbols. A fantastic animal with a fish tail and a goat's head is a symbol of the Capricorn constellation. The constellation Sagittarius was and is depicted as a centaur shooting from a bow. And this is Scorpio, a clear symbol of the zodiac constellation of the same name. The symbols of all 12 zodiac constellations are easily recognizable in the zodiac. You can also see the figure of a woman with her hands raised above her head. This is the Egyptian goddess Nut or the goddess of the sky: a symbol of the heaven. Often the female figure has an unnaturally stretched curved body, which bends around the drawing. This sign is constantly present in the Egyptian zodiacs and distinguishes them from other paintings. But is there an indication of a specific date here? Scientifically speaking, is this zodiac a horoscope? What is needed for a symbolic image of a specific date, in addition to the zodiac constellations, the Moon and the Sun? The planets need to be located in the positions in which they were in the sky on that day. In the Round Dendera zodiac there are many human figures with rods in their hands. These are symbols of the planets. Figures with rods in ancient symbolism were associated with movement, and planets are constantly moving celestial bodies. And these figures in the zodiac are not random, but in a certain order relative to the zodiac constellations. This means that a picture of the nighttime sky is depicted in the Round Dendera zodiac. Therefore, a specific date is encrypted. But what date could the builders of

Egyptian temples and tombs encrypt so accurately? Not far from Dendera, in a bow formed by a huge bend of the Nile, is the city of Esna. In the 19th century, Europeans discovered two temples here, in which zodiacs are depicted. These zodiacs are very similar in their symbolism to the Dendera ones, although there are slight differences among them. Both Dendera and Esna are located in the vicinity of the famous Luxor. The largest of the Egyptian temples were built here. The largest stone zodiacs have been found here. What message might they send us? Probably, the Egyptians encoded in the zodiacs on the ceilings of the Luxor, Dendera and Esna temples the dates of the events to which these temples were dedicated. It was probably a widespread custom. Colorful paintings on the walls and under the domes of sacred buildings tell about significant events, usually of the past. In the temples of Dendera and Esna, in the most honorable place, on the ceiling as well as the under-dome painting in Russian churches, by the way, there are zodiacs. This means that the dates encrypted in these zodiacs must have been very important for Egyptian history. But what are these dates? In the case when the zodiac is depicted, say, over the sarcophagus of the pharaoh or over the mummy of the deceased, then it is obvious that it depicts the date of death or the date associated with the life of this person. Well, most likely the date of death, but at least a date from his life. And here, calculating this date, we get dating of his life and death or some other event, but at least this is the time in the life of a particular person buried here. Here is an example of the zodiacs of the royal tomb. This is one of the most impressive Egyptian zodiacs. The Zodiac in the tomb of Ramesses VI. Like many other tombs, it is located in the Valley of the Kings. The zodiac is painted on the ceiling of the burial chamber, right above the pharaoh's sarcophagus. Most likely, it encrypts the date of birth or death of Ramesses VI, in similar fashion like in the tombs of other pharaohs. There are a lot of such zodiacs directly related to the burial places of kings. It was no coincidence that the Egyptians recorded dates in the form of zodiacs. They understood that to date this or that event using some kind of calendar era is not a very good idea. Because calendars change, the starting points of the calendar are forgotten. Sure, it is possible to count dates from, say, the accession of this or that pharaoh, but this is also a very shaky way. The time will come, when the pharaoh will be forgotten. Therefore, the astronomers of ancient Egypt understood that it was necessary to write the date somehow more invariantly, in a language that would be eternal, so that their descendants could then understand and read it. As the ancient Egyptians had hoped, scientists immediately decided to date the zodiacs using astronomical method. That is, to decipher the horoscopes in the zodiacs. In the famous Napoleonic oeuvre titled "Description of Egypt", published after the first expedition to Egypt, the zodiacs were called astronomical tables or sculptural zodiacs. No one doubted that they contained information about Egyptian history. Nineteenth-century European astronomers undertook a series of calculations. But after several attempts at dating, the Egyptian zodiacs were declared a figment of imagination of the ancient people and all research on this topic was curtailed. For many decades, official science seemed to have forgotten about the Egyptian zodiacs. To this day, the most important information that these ancient signs contain is inaccessible both to the wider scientific community or history buffs. And this did not happen by accident. There are two options. Either historians-Egyptologists simply could not decipher the zodiacs and do not want to admit it, or they still managed to read at least part of these ancient symbols. But the dates obtained during decoding did not at all coincide with the accepted chronology of Scaliger, so they had to be hidden. In the nineteenth century, astronomers studying the ancient Egyptian zodiacs discovered an incredible coincidence for which they had no explanation. These are the symbols of the zodiac constellations in the very same Round Dendera

zodiac: Leo, Sagittarius, Cancer, Capricorn. And this is a medieval map of the Northern Sky by Albrecht Dürer, created, as is commonly believed, in 1515. In the ancient Egyptian zodiac, and on the medieval map of Dürer, the constellations are labeled by the same symbols: Cancer, Leo, Sagittarius, Capricorn. If the Egyptian zodiacs were already known at the time of Dürer, then one could assume that he simply borrowed these symbols from the ancient Egyptians. But Dürer lived in the 16th century, and the zodiacs were discovered only in the 19th. Then why is the Egyptian symbolism, allegedly created several thousand years before the Common era, no different from the 16th century one? Then the astronomers made one attempt more. They suggested that the Egyptian zodiacs were not so ancient, and were created in the interval from the first to the third century AD. According to the official chronology, it was at this time that the dominion of the Roman Empire came to Egypt. The influence of Rome on the culture of the Egyptians could somehow explain the similarity of Egyptian and European symbols. This version was accepted and they started deciphering the horoscopes. And again failure. During Roman rule, the celestial alignments recorded in the horoscopes were never observed. An attempt to confirm the accepted antiquity of Egypt with the aid of the Egyptian zodiacs failed. The solution to the problem did not match the foregone conclusion. But the existence of the zodiacs in the Egyptian tombs could no longer be hidden. Egyptologists nonetheless had to offer some more or less plausible explanation. And they did offer it, although a completely unconvincing one. They stated that yes, we know the zodiacs of ancient Egypt, and yes, there are really a lot of them. Yes, indeed, there are constellations, and yes, there are, apparently, planets. But, the Egyptologists said that one should not think that these are horoscopes. One should not think that these are celestial configurations. These are most likely religious scenes, since in the past the planets were often considered gods. Mercury is both a planet and a god. Venus is both a planet and a goddess. Jupiter is both the chief deity and a bright planet. Let's take another look at the Round Dendera zodiac. This is the symbol of the Sun. These are the symbols of the planets Venus and Mercury. Both Venus and Mercury in the zodiac are located next to the Sun, that is, where they are supposed to be. The fact is that the planetary motions are subject to certain laws, and when viewed from the Earth, Venus and Mercury cannot be too far from the Sun, and, consequently, from each other. In a genuine horoscope, they should appear close to each other. This means that in the Dendera zodiac, Venus and Mercury are not gods, but planets. One may argue that this is just a coincidence. The artist's fantasy unexpectedly coincided with the real celestial composition. But here is another zodiac from the Dendera temple, called the rectangular Dendera zodiac. And again Venus and Mercury are next to the Sun. In our research, we have not come across a fantastical zodiac, which, under any interpretation, gives no solution. We do not know such zodiacs. There are zodiacs that give two or more solutions. If, as Egyptologists say, the zodiacs were really fantasies, then at least in some case this fantasy would lead to the violation of some astronomical laws. Well, let's say Venus would be too far from the Sun, or Mercury would be too far from the Sun. There are certain laws that do not allow every horoscope to appear in the sky. This never happened, even once. The astronomical laws in the zodiacs are always observed. And the resulting date, unambiguously or ambiguously, is always in the historical interval. If the Egyptian zodiacs are nothing more than figments of the artists' imagination, then why did these artists need to be so precise in depicting positions of the planets, instead of at least letting their imagination run free? A modern artist, depicting a fictional reality, is unlikely to draw the exact location of houses, say, on his street. Why would he? He can afford not to keep proportions right, to invent non-existent objects and so on. But if in every picture the artist depicts streets, houses, trees the way they look in

reality, then he does not paint from his imagination, but what he sees every day. In the case of the zodiacs, it is even more precise. The people who created these signs had the goal of the fixing position of the planets and luminaries in the sky and thus preserving a certain date. They did not know that in a few centuries these dates would not coincide with Scaliger's chronology. Many famous astronomers of the 19th century tried to date the Egyptian zodiacs. Dupuis, Laplace, Fourier, Letrohnne, Holm, Biot. Their results were negative. Such planetary combinations, that is, horoscopes, did not appear in the real sky, from ancient times to the Middle Ages. For later epochs, they did not dare to make calculations. Thus, it can be argued that astronomers of the 19th century, brought up with the Scaliger chronology, after all looked for dates in the zodiacs that could become irrefutable confirmation of the deep antiquity of Egypt, but they did not find such confirmation. At the beginning of the 20th century, the Russian scientist Nikolai Moro'zov got interested in dating the zodiacs of the Dendera temples. He was the first to propose dating the Egyptian zodiacs according to their astronomical content, without looking back at the traditional Scaligerian chronology. Moro'zov proved that the astronomical dating of the Egyptian zodiacs cannot in any way give the dates Egyptologists need. The solution must not be sought in a narrow period of time, but throughout the history of mankind. However, neither Moro'zov himself nor scientists who developed his methods could offer the exact dates, indisputable for each of the zodiacs. Egyptologists and their astronomers, who worked for them, set a time interval, and Moro'zov, you know, who did not believe in the Egyptologists' time intervals, was still limited in his calculations and still could not sort through too many options. Anyway, he had to choose one from some purely speculative considerations, from a number of possible interpretations. He just could not calculate everything. In order to make sense of all possible solutions and choose the right one from several suitable ones, additional information was needed. In 2001, Anatoly Fomenko and Gleb Nosovsky developed a new dating method, the method of the complete deciphering of the Egyptian zodiacs. They found out that the additional information that scientists previously lacked is in the zodiac itself. The ancient Egyptians took care of that too. We discovered an amazing thing that no one seemed to have noticed before. The fact is that, as it turned out, not just one zodiac was depicted in an ancient Egyptian zodiac, but often several, that is, not one horoscope, but several horoscopes. One horoscope, which we called the main or primary, is the horoscope that holds the date that the ancient astronomer and artist intended to record in this image. In addition, in this zodiac, Egyptian astronomers and artists also depicted astronomical information related to this year. Fomenko and Nosovsky perceived that the additional signs of the planets in the zodiacs are not accidental, they also make up horoscopes. Scientists called them secondary. A secondary horoscope is the position of the planets on the days of the spring and autumn equinoxes and on the days of the winter and summer solstices. And to avoid confusion, the planets were depicted using different symbols. The planets of the main horoscope were drawn simply, in the form of figures with rods. And in the symbols of the planets of secondary horoscopes, these figures or rods were necessarily placed on an object or on an animal. Most often you can see figures on a boat or on a snake. This greater amount of information made it possible to accurately record the desired date. The Egyptian zodiacs almost always have secondary horoscopes, and the Fomenko and Nosovsky method is precisely based on the fact that secondary horoscopes make it possible to verify and clarify the decoding of the main horoscope. The amazing discovery that we made in 2002 was that in the zodiacs, as it turned out, all the figures carry an astronomical meaning. And that in addition to images of the seven planets of antiquity in their astral places in the zodiac constellations, there is still additional astronomical

information. These are also planetary figures, and they didn’t turn out to be just a portrayal of some naive fantasies, but these are figures that carry a clear astronomical meaning, complementing the horoscope and allowing not only to unambiguously calculate the date, but also to confirm the decoding. Mathematicians have proposed an absolutely clear decryption algorithm. First, all the planetary symbols of the main horoscope and their positions in the zodiac constellations, the Sun and the Moon are determined. Then begins the search for all dates in the given historical interval. To do this, the HOROS computer program is used, which was specially created by Fomenko and Nosovsky for zodiacs dating. The disposition of the planets in a certain zodiac and the time interval within which the date must be searched are entered into the program. Finally, all calculated dates are verified. The verification is carried out based on planets visibility, their positions and compliance with the secondary horoscopes of this zodiac. There must be a complete match with the actual celestial representation of the given year. If there is a match, the date of the zodiac is determined. But the method of Fomenko and Nosovsky allows for deciphering the dates of those zodiacs that do not have secondary horoscopes as well, that is, when additional astronomical information was not provided. Such zodiacs are often found in Europe. For example, the zodiac on the old tapestry from the French city of Bayeux (The Bayeux Tapestry). Numerous tapestry researchers never noticed that there was an astronomical zodiac in this drawing. True, it was sometimes said that it depicts individual zodiac constellations. But that's all. The origin of this medieval cultural artifact is rather mysterious. The tapestry itself is a linen cloth about 70 meters long. In the center are embroidered scenes related to certain historical events. And the borders along the edges are decorated with symbols that scientists for some reason did not try to decipher. The decryption turned out to be very interesting. Anatoly Fomenko and Gleb Nosovsky realized that all the zodiac constellations are observed in the embroidered borders of the tapestry: from Leo to Virgo and back. That is, the pattern is cyclic. And this is nothing but an astronomical zodiac. The planets are depicted as human figures walking or standing on both legs. This is also common symbolism of the planet-wayfarers. But in the tapestry from Bayeux there are only planets of the main horoscope. There is no auxiliary information. Only the sun is duplicated in an additional small golden male figure next to Gemini. This way the summer solstice is marked. As we have already mentioned, there are no secondary horoscopes in the Bayeux Tapestry zodiac. According to the official account, the Tapestry depicts the Norman Conquest of England by William the Conqueror in the 11th century. And the Tapestry itself was supposedly made around the same time. But independent astronomical dating using the Fomenko-Nosovsky method gave a completely different date. The date March 15, 1495 is encrypted in the zodiac of the Tapestry and this is four centuries later than the official date. This means that it is possible that completely different historical events are depicted in the Tapestry. Thus, the dating method of Fomenko and Nosovsky makes it possible to decipher all the ancient zodiacs. It takes into account the fact that there may be a lot of solutions that need to be inspected. The given time interval should be very long and not limited to the usual historical periods. Only in this way can a truly correct solution be found. However, the date obtained may not at all coincide with the expectations of historians. During the Napoleonic campaign in Egypt, European scientists discovered a stone bas-relief measuring 25 by 42 and a half meters on the ceiling of the temple in Dendera. It consisted of two strips of images running along opposite sides of the ceiling, as if covering the space from both sides. Europeans called it the rectangular Dendera zodiac. The first Egyptologists estimated its age as 15 thousand years BC. Though later, scientists shifted the dating of this zodiac to the beginning of the Common era. Using

the method of Fomenko and Nosovsky, we will check how old the Dendera zodiac really is. Will the official version be confirmed? For our study, we will use a drawing from the publication “Description of Egypt”. The authors of the "New Chronology" believe that today this is the most accurate representation of the rectangular Dendera zodiac, because the zodiac itself has lost some details of the original image after restoration. And without these details, it is impossible to get an accurate decoding. So, step one. The figures of the zodiac constellations in the rectangular Dendera zodiac are easily recognizable. These signs are similar to those of the constellations in other zodiacs. The planets of the main horoscope are represented as wayfarers with rods, also a traditional symbolism. Saturn, a male wayfarer with a planetary rod in his hand to the right of Aquarius, with a crescent over his head, is in the region of Aquarius or Capricorn. Jupiter is a male wayfarer with a planetary rod in his hand between Pisces and Aries. Next to his head is an inscription “Hor Apis Seta”, which means the planet Jupiter. Mars is a male wayfarer with a planetary rod in his hand and the head of a falcon between Pisces and Aquarius. Venus is depicted as two wayfarers following one after another, with planetary rods in their hands between Aries and Taurus. Ahead is a man with the head of a beast, and behind him is a woman with a star above her head. The star means that Venus was visible at that moment, which is very important for deciphering. Mercury is a two-faced male wayfarer with a planetary rod in his hand between Aries and Taurus. He does not have a star above his head, that is, Mercury was invisible that day. The location of the planets of the main horoscope is determined. There are few figures of secondary horoscopes here, they are also easily recognizable. They either stand on some objects, or put their rod on them. Here, for example, is a woman with a rod, which she put on Capricorn. Two women in a boat to the left of Gemini. A man with a planetary rod, standing in a boat between the constellation Gemini and the edge of the zodiac. The female figure with a rod on Capricorn is Venus. The sun bird on the woman's shoulder is the sign of the winter solstice in the Egyptian zodiac. This is the horoscope for the winter solstice. And in the year, which is encrypted in the rectangular Dendera zodiac, Venus was in Capricorn that day. The two women in the boat is also clearly a sign of Venus. This planet is generally quite often found in secondary horoscopes. Nearby are the symbols of the summer solstice, customary for Egyptian horoscopes. A boat that carries a calf lying in it. The perch with the solar bird on top of it. A man in a boat near the constellation of Gemini, holding his rod high, is most likely also a symbol of the Sun. All figures together make up a secondary horoscope of the summer solstice. Female figures are quite close to the constellation Taurus. And this means that in that year Venus on the day of the summer solstice was in Taurus or close nearby. Other planets were not visible. The secondary horoscope of the spring equinox in this zodiac is not very clear. There is only a male figure that makes an offering. It can be identified as any planet at all, excepting Venus, which was near the Sun that day. On the other hand the autumn equinox horoscope is quite detailed. You can see a female figure with a leonine head next to the sign of the constellation Virgo. This is Venus. Moreover, the leonine head is equipped with a crescent in the form of horns. The crescent in this case is the symbol of the Moon. And the whole horoscope says that on the day of the autumnal equinox in the indicated year, Venus and the Moon were visible and were not far from the Sun. There were no other planets in the vicinity of the Sun. Thus, all secondary horoscopes in the rectangular Dendera zodiac are deciphered. Step two. Using the HOROS software, all dates are calculated when the disposition of the planets in the sky corresponded to their location in the rectangular zodiac. There must be an exact matching of the planetary disposition between the solution and the rectangular zodiac. Solutions that do not meet this condition are not accepted. Historians believe that this zodiac

was composed no earlier than the beginning of the Common era. Therefore, to search for solutions, a time interval is set from 500 BC to 1900 AD. We get several dozen preliminary dates, randomly scattered throughout the specified period. And finally, step three. Another computer software is used for verification; Volynkin's Turbo-Sky astronomical program. Firstly, the exact agreement between the real location of the planets in the zodiac constellations and the picture of the rectangular zodiac in the chosen interpretation is verified. Secondly, the exact visibility conditions are to be observed. Venus must be visible on the day in question, and Mercury must be invisible between Taurus and Aries. Thirdly, the exact correlation between the chosen solution and all secondary horoscopes in the rectangular Dendera zodiac is estimated. That is, the horoscopes of the autumn and spring equinoxes and the winter and summer solstices. So, the rectangular Dendera zodiac, which historians attribute to the first centuries of the Common era, contains the date: April 22-26, 1168 AD. The second zodiac, the Round one, the most famous zodiac of Egypt, by the way. This round one, it is small, on the ceiling of this little chapel, located on the roof of a large temple. Its date is March 20, 1185. These 2 dates, they are close to each other; the difference is about 17 years. According to the official chronology, the history of ancient Egypt began over four thousand years ago and ended in the first centuries of the Common era. The temples and tombs of the famous Valley of the Kings were allegedly built during this period. In 2002-2003, Anatoly Fomenko and Gleb Nosovsky deciphered several dozen so-called ancient Egyptian zodiacs. And the very first results of studying the zodiacs using the method of independent astronomical dating disproved the official version. It turned out that the dates of the Middle Ages of the Common era are encrypted in the zodiacs. From our dating it follows that all the known ancient Egyptian history, including all the events known to us from the history of the pharaohs, occurred no earlier than the 10th century AD. Here are the dates of the Egyptian zodiacs, obtained using the complete decoding method. The zodiac of the Seti the 1st gives either August 14-16, 969 AD, or August 5-7, 1206 AD. There are two options. And Egyptologists date the reign of Seti the 1st to the 13th century BC. The zodiac of the Big Temple of Esna: March 31-April 3, 1394 AD. The zodiac of Ramesses IV is either April 15-16, 1146 AD, or April 16, 1325 AD. There are also two options. And according to Egyptologists, the reign of Ramesses IV is the 12th century BC. The Thebes color zodiac of Ramesses VII: September 5-8, 1182 AD but traditional history assures us that the reign of Ramesses VII is the 12th century BC. We see that the dates written in the zodiacs differ by more than two to two and a half thousand years from the dates established by historians. Moreover, there is a separate case, rather rare, when the famous Brugsch zodiac dates by the middle of the 19th century. This is a special case. Apparently, in ancient Egypt there was a practice of making ancient coffins and writing dates on them in the form of zodiacs until the 19th century. It is quite possible that European astronomers of the 19th century, having deciphered the ancient zodiacs, got precisely these dates. Therefore, further research was tabooed. Too much this information diverged from the traditional version of the development of human civilization. But the studies of Anatoly Fomenko and Gleb Nosovsky, their method of the complete decoding of zodiacs proved that the history of Egypt, as well as the Whole World History, is very different from the one we know. In our opinion, the rejection of our results by historians is caused by one reason, the unwillingness of historians or their inability to work in the field of chronology, in the discipline of dating. Historians want to consider chronology as an unchanging dogma, absolute truth, and start from it. That's what they want. Moreover, since many previous generations of historians have already worked with the Scaligerian chronology, they really do not want to abandon it, realizing that they will have to do it all over again to work with the New

chronology. Therefore, as in the case of Moro’zov's work, Egyptologists try not to discuss the zodiacs dating, because they are completely objective and anyone can double-check our result and make sure that the dates from the Middle Ages are obtained. And it is clear that these dates are very dangerous for the chronology of Scaliger-Petavius. That is why historians try to avoid this discussion and obscure the issue with references to the supposedly religious and mystical meaning of these images. None of the dates deciphered in the Egyptian zodiacs confirms the chronology of Ancient Egypt generally accepted today. On the contrary, these dates completely refute it. Anatoly Fomenko and Gleb Nosovsky proved that all the Egyptian zodiacs known today were created in the period from the 11th to the 19th century AD. This means that the history of Ancient Egypt is several thousand years younger than the one that historians impose on us. It is not surprising that they stubbornly reject these dates and call them random. But if all these dates are random, then why didn't any of them accidentally fall into that period of time that would suit the historians of the Scaligerian school? Historians cannot answer this question. But the answer is given by the New Chronology. And these are not speculative assumptions that Champollion or Brugsch did in their time, but serious scientific research based on modern mathematical methods. Not only the history of Ancient Egypt, but the Whole World History puts forward many questions, the answers to which cannot be obtained remaining within the framework of traditional history and chronology. The Scaligerian historians often confused not only the time, but also the place of historical events, confused the names of countries and cities.

## Lord Novgorod the Great, who are you?

How do you do, Lord Novgorod the Great? Chronicle Veliky Novgorod (Great Newtown) has always occupied a special place among other ancient Russian cities. Throughout Russian history until the beginning of the 17th century, it competed on equal terms first with Kyiv, and then with Moscow for the right to be called the capital of Russia. We know all this from school textbooks. But the excavations that have been going on for many years in modern Veliky Novgorod give reason to assert that Novgorod on the river Volkhov has never really been a major state and commercial center. In addition, the analysis of ancient annals and chronicles, carried out by Russian scientists, showed that many entries in these texts contradict the generally accepted view of the Russian history in general and the history of Veliky Novgorod in particular. What do we know about it? Is the city on the river Volkhov really the famous Novgorod the Great, the splendor and glory of all Russia? And if this is not so, then which of the ancient Russian cities was the very chronicle Veliky Novgorod? Or maybe Veliky Novgorod is something more than just a city? Few people know that the chronology by which we live now was formed in the 16th century. Only by that time, the medieval scientists attempted to build a certain system of global dates. This officially recognized time scale is called Scaligerian chronology by the name of the most important chronologist of those years, Joseph Scaliger. Many prominent scientists of the past understood that Scaliger's chronology contains significant errors. This was pointed out by Isaac Newton, Academician Nikolai Morozov and many others. These errors distorted the whole picture of ancient and medieval history as a whole. The famous chronologist of the 20th century, Bekkerman, lamented the chaos of medieval dating. Therefore, the currently accepted version of world history can hardly be considered true. It

contains too many far-fetched conclusion, omissions and obvious contradictions. But how to build a new consistent concept of history? This is an extremely difficult task and it seems that historians cannot cope with it without the help of other sciences and, first of all, without the help of mathematics. Academician Anatoly Fomenko, a scientist and mathematician from Moscow State University, has been analyzing ancient and medieval chronology since 1973. He managed to obtain a number of fundamental results in this area. In 1981, Gleb Nosovsky, Candidate of Physics and Mathematics (PhD), joined the work on the New Chronology. Scientists have come to the firm conviction that the versions of Ancient and Medieval history presented to us from school-days contain significant errors, and their root cause is in the wrong chronology. The goal of the scientific project "New Chronology" is to create independent and reliable mathematical statistical methods for dating ancient and medieval events. For several years I and my colleagues have been creating such methods. Today there are about 7 of them. And they are based on the processing a large amount of data that is extracted from old texts. These are references, various names mentioned by ancient authors, descriptions of eclipses, and things like that. These methods were later applied to the real chronicles, real annals. We tell in detail about the unique methods of examination the past, developed by mathematicians Anatoly Fomenko and Gleb Nosovsky, which make it possible to objectively, without reference to the Scaliger time scale, analyze the events of real chronicles and annals. Studying ancient documents, scientists began to note many strange inconsistencies that official history passed over in silence. Let's take a closer look at some of them. A well-known chronicler from Arkhangelsk tells that in 1434 the Grand Duke Vasily Vasilyevich was defeated near Rostov by Prince Yuri; after which he fled to Veliky Novgorod and from there to Kostroma and Nizhny Novgorod. The Chronicle literally says so and the word “fled” is used. From Moscow to Kostroma and through Veliky Novgorod. And his other opponent, who after a while also very quickly fled from Rostov the Great to Kostroma, also through Veliky Novgorod. If you look at the map, it becomes quite obvious that through Veliky Novgorod in the modern sense, the city that is located on the river Volkhov, to flee from Moscow to Kostroma, and even more so from Rostov to Kostroma, is completely pointless, because this is the way there and back. Moreover, today there is a highway, there is a railway, but, in fact, it is an impassable path through swamps, which, perhaps, could be overpassed in winter. And it was, by the way, not a winter time as annals say. Therefore, the question arose, what does the chronicle mean by Veliky Novgorod? According to school textbooks, Veliky Novgorod is known to us as the largest city in Russia, which played an important role in the Russian history. The first Russian prince Rurik is considered a Novgorodian. Holy Great Prince Vladimir and Yaroslav the Great, and Alexander Nevsky were also called Novgorod princes. Ancient chronicles tell us about this. From the same sources it is known that Veliky Novgorod and Moscow were connected by a great road. Yes, indeed. Throughout the history of both Kievan and Vladimir-Suzdalian Russia, the Grand Dukes of Kyiv, Vladimir, Moscow constantly traveled to Veliky Novgorod. But in this case, between Kyiv and chronicle Novgorod, Moscow and chronicle Novgorod, there should have been well-worn roads, old cities. As a matter of curiosity what road the Grand Dukes traveled from Moscow to Novgorod on the river Volkhov. The city is completely isolated in this sense. There are no historical centers for many hundreds of kilometers in the direction of Moscow and Kyiv. Apart from Pskov, the largest old Russian cities closest to Volkhov Novgorod are at least 500 kilometers away. Although usually the largest centers are surrounded by other cities and well-travelled roads. Trying to figure out where Veliky Novgorod was, after all, and how to understand the indications of the annals, we turned to the history of Novgorod on the river

Volkhov and what happened there, what is known there and whether it corresponds to the descriptions that we know from the annals. Well, it immediately caught my eye that it does not correspond, and moreover, it is very inconsistent. Well, what do we know about Veliky Novgorod from the annals? From the annals it is known that Veliky Novgorod was the largest state formation in Medieval Europe in terms of area. It was a boyar republic, owning colossal natural resources. The trade turnover had no equal in Russia. Veliky Novgorod was part of the Hanseatic League, a confederation of merchant guilds and market towns in Northern Europe. The famous route from the Varangians to the Greeks, connecting Scandinavia with Byzantium in the Middle Ages, went through Veliky Novgorod. Let's try to go this way through Novgorod on the river Volkhov. From the Baltic Sea through the Gulf of Finland we get to the Neva. Then to Lake Ladoga and from it along the Volkhov River to Lake Ilmen. Further, in order to get from Novgorod on the river Volkhov to Russia, that is, to Central Russia or to the south, you need to sail along the river Msta. And the Msta is a very turbulent, very rapid river, which is completely unsuitable for trade routes. In addition, if we literally take the words of the chronicles, along this path it was necessary to go up the Dnieper, say, from the Greeks to the Varangians, then make a drag to the river Lovat and then continue the voyage. But on the way one would have to cross the Western Dvina. Here on this path, if you take it literally, then, having risen up the Dnieper, you had to make a portage of several hundred kilometers, crossing the Western Dvina along the way. Why, while crossing the Dvina, continue another 100 or even more kilometers of portage, instead of getting on boats and sailing along the Western Dvina and calmly sailing into the Baltic Sea, where they headed? Move on. So, from the annals we know that Russia traded with the West through Veliky Novgorod. Karamzin, in his History of the Russian State, definitely indicates that the main international trade in Russia at that time was not far from Yaroslavl at the mouth of the Mologa River. What to believe, the annals or the History of the Russian State? Maybe they don't contradict each other? Let's remember Karamzin's version, but for now let's take a closer look at the Novgorod Kremlin. The Novgorod Kremlin or Detinets is located in the very heart of the city. The length of the walls is 1350 meters. For comparison, the length of the walls of the Trinity Lavra of St. Sergius near Moscow is 1250 meters, the Borisoglebsky Monastery near Rostov the Great is one and a half kilometers, but the fortress city of Pskov is as much as nine kilometers. So, in terms of the scale of ancient Russian urban planning, the Novgorod Kremlin is nothing more than a monastery of a rather modest size. The most noticeable detail of the architectural ensemble of the Novgorod Kremlin is St. Sophia Cathedral. In the tourist guide to the Novgorod Kremlin we read: "Until our time, the cathedral has retained its original forms." Has it really never been rebuilt since the 11th century? Let's listen to the guide of the Volkhov Novgorod Kremlin. “And one of the oldest churches in our country is our Novgorod St. Sophia Cathedral. In 1045, the construction of St. Sophia Cathedral began. In 40 years our church will celebrate its thousandth anniversary. That is, our ancestors didn’t build for centuries, but rather they built for millennia.” And as for the St. Sophia Cathedral. It looks fairly new. It has no building settlement. An ancient cathedral must have building settlement. This one doesn't have it. For nine centuries, a cultural deposit has accumulated around the cathedral, covering the lower part of the building by 2 meters. This is too small for such an ancient building. In archeology, there is such a basic concept of "cultural deposit". This is household waste, construction waste, everything that was thrown underfoot, all this accumulated quietly, imperceptibly, year after year. In our day, in general, in a modern city, the cultural deposit accumulates as well. Now, if we look at how asphalt is laid, we will see this puff pastry pie. New asphalt is laid on top of the old

asphalt. Sometimes the old one is cut off, sometimes not. The same thing happened in the Middle Ages. For many years, over centuries of the city's life, this cultural deposit has been accumulating. 1 meter per century — this accumulation rate of the cultural deposit was calculated by archaeologists on the basis of a puff pastry pie concept, which is a cut of wooden pavements. According to historians, it allows to accurately date the age of the city. The well-known researcher of Novgorod, the head of the Novgorod archaeological expedition, academician Valentin Yanin writes: "Without rotting, the cultural deposit accumulated in the Middle Ages at a rate of 1 centimeter per year. From the middle of the 10th century to the end of the 15th century, it accumulated there by five and a half meters". So, for five hundred and fifty years, a meter per century. Consequently, if we count from the 20th century about 500 years of the cultural deposit of Volkhov Novgorod, we get the 15th century as the date of its foundation. And for St. Sophia Cathedral the 17th century, since it was only two meters deep. The cathedral, built in the 17th century, is mistaken for antiquity! Why is this happening? Who needed to hide the true age of an architectural structure? Move on. From the annalistic history of Veliky Novgorod, we know a lot about the Novgorod Vladychny Courtyard. The tourist guide to the Novgorod Kremlin says: "The Vladychny Courtyard of the Novgorod Kremlin is an outstanding complex of civil architecture structures. Here were located Administrative and economic services. Here lived the Novgorod archbishop, the owner of a huge sovereign treasury, the Council of Lords gathered, the internal and external policy of Novgorod the Great was decided." Created according to a distinct plan complying with the idea of functional residential architecture, Vladychny Courtyard was something completely new in Russian culture and was an outstanding phenomenon of urban planning. It was a state within a state that could provide itself with everything necessary. There were cookhouses, kvass, handicrafts, dryers, baths, forges, a well, cattle and stable yards, warehouses and cellars with supplies. Contemporaries enthusiastically talked about the numerous chambers, passages, a pillar with a clock and other wonders. And the metropolitan's palace itself was a huge three-story building that stretched along the entire Kremlin wall". And here is what we see today in Novgorod on Volkhov. So, we are at the Vladychny Courtyard of Novgorod. This courtyard is associated with the names of the Novgorod lords, and all the buildings here are associated with the highest ranks of the Novgorod clergy. Next to St. Sophia Cathedral is the Nikitsky building, the 17th century structure. Note. Almost all the buildings that we see now were built in the 17th century and later. But even if we assume that the old buildings were destroyed for some reason, it is difficult to imagine that the mind-boggling Novgorod state in the state, for centuries could fit on this patch of land. It also does not match the chronicle texts. Well, it's just a regular yard. There is a small building of the 17th century. There are dozens of such buildings in Moscow. And there are similar constructions in other cities, nothing outstanding. The only building of the Vladychny Courtyard, which could have been built during the reign of the archbishops, is the so-called Chamber of Facets. We learn about the existence of the Chamber of Facets from the Novgorod Chronicles. In 1433, it was built by "German craftsmen from abroad" this is what the chronicle tells us. After its construction the Chamber of Facets of Novgorod received the name "Vladychnaya", for it was built by order of the Novgorod archbishop Efimy 2nd. The Novgorod chronicle of 1433 reports: "The same summer, the appointed Reverend Bishop Euphemius set up a chamber in his courtyard. And it has 30 doors, and it was made by the German masters, the ones from over the sea with the Novgorod masters". Is this really a masterpiece of ancient Russian architecture of the 15th century, construction of which required joint efforts of Novgorod and German craftsmen sent from abroad? The Vladychny

Chamber in the form that has come down to us is the most ordinary house of the 17th-19th centuries. There are a lot of such buildings in Russian cities. And how could 30 doors fit here? And the buildings are completely different from how the Chamber of Facets should look like. For example, in the Moscow Kremlin there is the famous Palace of the Facets. It is immediately obvious that it is faceted. It is lined with faceted stone. And in Novgorod, this is an ordinary house. There are no edges on its walls. The question is, where did they go? These very same faces are made of stone. Everything had to be trimmed. But it is made from regular stones. Ordinary building, ordinary bricks. It is possible that someone knocked down all the numerous edges and hewed off the walls, but the chronicles do not report anything like that. Then, perhaps, unsightly on the outside, it will surprise us from the inside? Not at all. But the main hall of the Chamber of Facets of Veliky Novgorod was the first Russian diplomatic hall. Here they received the ambassadors of the Moscow Grand Duke, foreign guests, proclaimed the highest decrees. It repeatedly became a witness of fateful historical events. Here the decree of Ivan the 3rd was announced on the annexation of Novgorod to Moscow. Ivan the Terrible also arrived here on a denunciation of the Novgorod boyars. And from here he controlled the defeat of Novgorod. By the way, another question is connected with this fact, to which historians cannot find an answer. Let's listen to the guide of the Novgorod Kremlin. Ivan the Terrible, having gathered 10,000 oprichniks (guardsmen), arrived in Novgorod. That bloody nightmarish feast that took place in the Vladychnaya Chamber, where the tsar was received, was remembered with horror by generations of Novgorodians. In the middle of the feast, the Terrible hit the floor with his staff. And this was the signal by which the oprichnina defeat of Novgorod began. In 10 days, the guardsmen slaughtered about 3,000 boyar families. On the streets of the city oprichniks behaved as if they were in a hostile city. They killed a lot of people. The bodies were thrown into pits. That was a real massacre. But then why can't archaeologists, who have been working in Novgorod for a long time, find a single mass grave of those years? Let's remember this fact. We will return to it later. Ever since school, we have known about the famous Novgorod Vetché, which took place in the so-called Yaroslav's Court in Novgorod. In the Novgorod charters they wrote: "The people of Novgorod decided at the Vetché, at the Yaroslav’s Court." Historians claim that Yaroslav's Court and the Trade place were the busiest places in the city in ancient times. Karamzin mentions that at the ringing of the Vetché bell, ten thousand Novgorodians gathered in the square. Academician Yanin for a long time, by his own account, was looking for Yaroslav's Court in Veliky Novgorod. In the end, a court was presented as being Yaroslav's Courtyard, on which, as he himself says, about 50 people could fit in, no more. So, his conclusion is that the annals greatly exaggerated the size. That was such a courtyard, just 50 people. A trampled place. Well, excuse me, 50 people gathered at a regular village meeting. I think even more, in any Russian village. Maybe only the upper strata of society were present at the Vetché? But then it would be no longer a Vetché. Here, wherever you look, everywhere it turns out that what is presented in Novgorod on the river Volkhov as remains of Veliky Novgorod; all this does not correspond to what should have been. Recall the so-called "puff pastry pie"; a term that came into common use by archaeologists precisely in Novgorod. Let us take the point of view of traditional history. It claims that the annalistic Veliky Novgorod was founded in the tenth century and that this is Novgorod on the Volkhov river. But, in this case, it is clear that as soon as, for one reason or another, the city was founded on the Volkhov swamps; immediately wooden pavements had to be lain. Academician Valentin Yanin writes: “Every three decades, Novgorodians laid new pavements on top of the old ones, still intact, but buried in moist clay soil that preserved the tree,

and the pavements grew over the centuries. And so, over five hundred and fifty years of the formation of the most ancient cultural deposit, 28 tiers of pavements lay one on top of the other here; a giant woodpile of perfectly preserved pine floorings". The trees of each next floor grew for some time along with those trees that were laid in the previous layer. By comparing the thickness of tree rings, one can determine how long they have been growing together. In good years, the rings of the tree are thicker and grow well. In dry years, the rings are thinner, and so on. Therefore, the graph of the thickness of the rings seems to tell you the events from the life of this tree. One might expect that for trees of the same climatic zone, these graphs will be more or less similar, comparable. By linking graphs one after another, you can try to build a scale and stretch it into the past, and on this basis, then date new samples. We did not specifically check the calculations that Yanin and his group carried out in this case, but the idea is reasonable and we completely trust them and think that they most likely were not mistaken here. Moving on. The perfect preservation of the lower layer of the Volkhov pavements means that this is the first layer. The first pavement, the first layer is very well preserved, and, therefore, it was indeed the first layer. Because if it were not the first but say the 10th, 20th, and all before that would have rotted, then this destruction would be gradual. Then a completely rotten layer would have been lying under the half-rotten one. And since the first layer is in good condition, it means that it is really the first one and there is nothing under it. Pavements had to be laid in recent times, relatively recent, but up to the time when asphalt laying began. Therefore, if we subtract 550 years from, say, the middle of the twentieth century to, conditionally, 1950, when asphalting had already begun, well, we get 1400 for the first layer. But archaeologists date it to the 11th century, 400 years earlier. They get such a picture that in the 11th century started laying pavements. 550 years of laying until the 15th century, and then a problem arises. What to do with the rest of the pavements from the 15th to the 20th century that have not been preserved? Why then is it considered that the dating of the Volkhov "puff pastry pie" is absolutely accurate and refers to the era from the 10th to the 15th century? Academician Yanin, the head of the Novgorod archaeological expedition, writes: "For starters, we managed to obtain a relative dendrochronological scale. Then it was possible to get absolute dates. To do this, logs used in the foundations of Novgorod churches were studied, which time of construction was reliably known from the annals". This means that the chronicles were taken from which the dates of construction of several churches were extracted. According to this dating, the age of the logs of the Novgorod pavements was calculated. But no independent confirmation of annalistic dates has been carried out. They say the following, that yes, the ancient ones have been preserved, but the new ones, for some reason, have not been preserved. They disappeared, decayed completely and turned into dust. But this assumption requires proof. It's kind of, I would say, very strange. Therefore, when we are told that your research contradicts the dendrochronology of Veliky Novgorod, more precisely, Novgorod on the Volkhov river, we always answer no, their research does contradict, their version does contradict. Ours is in very good agreement. Based on the study of the "puff pastry pie" of Novgorod pavements, the authors of the New chronology concluded that the very first settlement on this site should have been dated no earlier than the 15th century, and not at all the 10th. It is known that there really was a settlement on the site of modern Novgorod on the Volkhov river, which was built as a fortress for the war with the Swedes in the 17th century. The annals of that time say that the locals called this place not Novgorod, but simply Okolotok. Here is what is written in the tourist guide to the Novgorod Kremlin: "In the 14-16 centuries, the whole territory of the Detinets (citadel) was called Okolotok, except for the Vladychny Courtyard. The name "Okolotok"

came into use instead of the name "Novgorod", which originally meant the entire citadel of the 11-12th centuries, and then the entire territory of the city." Strange text, isn't it? By trying to justify the name of the place, it confuses even more. So, if Novgorod on the river Volkhov is just Okolotok, where was Lord Novgorod the Great? Let's recall the Grand Duke Vasily Vasilyevich and take his route one more time. One glance at the map was enough to suspect, although it was only a suspicion at first, that Yaroslavl was called Veliky Novgorod. Because on the way from Moscow to Kostroma or from Rostov to Kostroma there is such a large city that could pull off the title of Veliky Novgorod, and Veliky Novgorod is the city with the highest-profile in Russian history. Yaroslavl is the largest city on the upper river Volga. The high and steep banks of the Volga and Kotorosl, the deep ravine of the northern side turned Old Yaroslavl into a natural fortified island. In addition, it was well located on the way from Vladimir-Suzdalian Russia to Western Europe through the White Sea. This ancient path, just near Yaroslavl, joined with another important ancient route along the Volga. And all these roads go exclusively through Yaroslavl. Because Yaroslavl becomes a kind of transit point between Moscow, the capital and those directions, these are Siberia, Mangazeya, Arkhangelsk, Western Europe and the Orient. So, can you imagine what was going on here? Let us recall the words of Karamzin. He definitely indicates that the main trade in Russia at that time was at the mouth of the Mologa River, near Yaroslavl, at the intersection of the Severodvinsk and Volga routes. The Severodvinsk route leads from the Baltic Sea through the North Sea, the White Sea, Arkhangelsk, the Northern Dvina, Veliky Ustyug, and then through the Sukhona and through Vologda to Sheksna and Mologa. At the mouth of the Mologa, it enters the Volga, joining the Volga route. The Volga route went south and east, and from the east, caravans came from China and India to the Volga. In fact, it connects the whole of Eurasia with this Molozhsky trade, that is, with the Molozhsky fair. The 17th-century historian Deacon Timothy Kamenevich-Rvovsky, in his essay on Russian antiquities, writes: "In ancient times there were great trades at the mouth of the glorious Mologa River. Merchants from many German and Polish, and Lithuanian, and Greek, and Roman states came to trade. They say that Persian and of other lands as well. So many ships gathered at the mouth of the Mologa that people crossed the mouth and even the Volga without a bridge, moving from ship to ship". Trades took place on the Molozhsky meadow, as the historian wrote: "Great and beautiful, and it was a circle of seven miles." By the way, the Scandinavians who traded with chronicle Novgorod called it Holmgrad. Kholmogory is an old Russian port on the White Sea. It retained its commercial importance until the founding of St. Petersburg. For the Scandinavians, trade with Russia was connected precisely with Kholmogory-Holmgrad, the first Russian port on the way to Yaroslavl, where the establishment of foreign merchants was located; there was a brisk trade in foreign goods. Here were the shops of the Dutch guests, the French, the Germans. But the name Germans (Nemtcy) in general in Russia was used to call everyone who poorly understood the Russian language or did not speak Russian. Dumb (Nemoi in Russian), Germans (Nemtcy), but there were also Italians, Spaniards, Chinese, Persians. This is a huge variety of goods. And of the 13 royal guests, that is, the richest, well, as you can now say the "oligarchs" of the 17th century, half lived in Yaroslavl. That is, it was a key city. In the seventeenth century, Yaroslavl was the second largest city in Russia, second only to the capital, Moscow. Western Eurasia carried silver to the Yaroslavl market. The Orient delivered various goods. According to the established procedure, trade was conducted only through the Russian kopek. For a certain fee all imported silver had to be recoined. A tax of about 10-15 percent was taken for recoining silver into kopeks. Such was the tax from the entire trade turnover between East and West, which was rigorously collected by the

Russian treasury. So much duty was collected that it was measured in poods (16 kilogram). The chronicler writes: “that duty in poods was; 180 poods and more were collected in the treasury of the Grand Duke.” It is known that the first silver mine in Russia was commissioned at the end of the 17th, in the 18th century. Prior to that, all Russian silver was taken from cellars. And in the cellars lay Western European thalers. A very large accumulation of buried treasures is known to be near Yaroslavl. There are Arab coins, the so-called Kufic coins, which is also natural for the center of international trade. Since they traded there, it means that there was a lot of money there. Money, naturally, was hidden from time to time. There must be hidden treasures. There is nothing like that in Volkhov Novgorod. But Yaroslavl presents surprises that official history is unable to explain. Yaroslavl’s Dormition Cathedral. It was built in the 17th century and completely destroyed in the 20th. Excavations are underway here now. Under the very altar, masonry rubble of an older cathedral was discovered, which was destroyed in the seventeenth century. Along with the masonry rubble, archaeologists saw a huge mass grave. It's like a mass grave. All the skeletons that have been preserved here, they have traces of violent death. The majority are women and children. Most likely, the people we found here, died as a result of some kind of military conflict. According to official history, Yaroslavl has never been taken by enemy since the invasion of Batu Khan. Massacres in Yaroslavl the Middle Ages are also unknown. It turns out that historians cannot say anything about this burial. And now let's remember Veliky Novgorod. There, according to the chronicles, mass graves should have remained. But there is nothing in Novgorod on the river Volkhov. And in Yaroslavl, where history does not report any massacre in the 16th century, even in the Time of Troubles, when the troops of Minin and Pozharsky entered Yaroslavl, there was no battle in Yaroslavl. There, in Yaroslavl, there is such a grave. So, I emphasize that these are old burials; this is not the twentieth century and not the 19th. Only bones, no traces of clothes, anything else. But it is under the foundations of the 17th century church and therefore belongs to the 16th century, but not earlier. The history of Yaroslavl before the 17th century is completely obscure. According to scientists Anatoly Fomenko and Gleb Nosovsky, it is because the true biography of Veliky Novgorod was taken from Yaroslavl and unfairly transferred to another city, Novgorod on the Volkhov. In Novgorod on the Volkhov there is a small fortress, built no earlier than the 17th century. Yaroslavl, as befits an ancient capital, was a well-fortified city. Even in the 17th century, after a complete defeat, it had 24 towers placed on the rampart, but without walls. Most of the old towers in Yaroslavl were dismantled in the 18th and early 19th centuries. But those that have survived give an idea of the power of the city's fortifications. It is curious how historical science explains such a number of Yaroslavl towers without walls. After all, it is believed that Yaroslavl was not subjected to defeat. Then who destroyed its walls and when did it happen? Historians offer such an explanation. They say that the powerful fortifications of Yaroslavl that existed until the middle of the 17th century were wooden and completely burned down in 1658. After the fire, a significant part of the towers was restored, but the walls were not restored. Even the logic of ordinary common sense suggests that such a restoration is pointless, because towers without walls are not fortifications. But everything falls into place if we keep in mind that Yaroslavl is Veliky Novgorod. It is known that in the second half of the 16th century all the fortifications of Veliky Novgorod were destroyed. The goal was quite understandable; to deprive the city of its fortifications. To do this, it was sufficient to tear down the walls. The towers were left as useful outbuildings. Does this mean that Yaroslavl was that Veliky Novgorod, the pride and glory of all Russia? Surely, Yaroslavl was a very good fit and we started digging into this issue further. The hypothesis of the authors of the

New Chronology is as follows. The famous in Russian history name “Lord Novgorod the Great” didn’t mean one city, but rather an entire region. This region was the capital until the moment when the capital was moved to Moscow. The composition of the Lord Novgorod the Great included Yaroslavl, Rostov, Kostroma, Pereslavl, Vladimir, Suzdal and other cities of Vladimir-Suzdalian Russia. Veliky Novgorod, as we now understand, was called the interfluve of the Oka and Volga, that is, the whole of Vladimir-Suzdalian Russia in a broad sense. And Yaroslavl is Veliky Novgorod in the narrow sense, or rather; it is Yaroslav's Courtyard of Veliky Novgorod. Because in Veliky Novgorod there is such a famous city itself, and even more famous is the place where they actually gathered at the Vetché, where the most important issues were resolved. This is the so-called, famous in the annals Yaroslav's Courtyard of Veliky Novgorod. Yaroslavl is precisely this very Yaroslav's Courtyard, and Veliky Novgorod, as we now understand, is Vladimir-Suzdalian Russia between the Oka and Volga rivers. The Novgorod chronicles speak of the independent ends of Novgorod, which sometimes even fought among themselves. Each end had its own head, its own seal. Moreover, several seals from each end were at once attached to the Novgorod letters. For example, there are 8 of them on one of the oldest Novgorod letters. From time to time, representatives of the ends converged on a Vetché in Yaroslavl-courtyard, that is, in the city of Yaroslavl. This is fully confirmed, for example, by Scandinavian sources. The famous 17th-century Swedish cartographer Olaf Magnus calls Veliky Novgorod a country of cities. How was it depicted on the maps of that time? Here is a fragment of the Olaf Magnus’ map. Please note that the region of Veliky Novgorod is located east of Moscow, and is also marked with the sign of the princely ruler. This corresponds well to Yaroslavl, but does not fit at all with the location of Novgorod on the Volkhov river. Too bad the Swedish cartographer's map ends right here. Here is the famous book by Sigismund Herberstein "Notes on Muscovite Affairs", one of the very first editions, Vienna, 1557. And this is an enlarged fragment of the northwestern part of the map from Herberstein's book. It is immediately evident that the name Veliky Novgorod (Gros Newgart) for some reason is not accompanied by the symbol of the city. All other cities on this map are marked with small pictures-symbols showing the exact location of the city, and are also titled. Only one city of Veliky Novgorod is not marked with a symbol. It is clearly seen that above the upper reaches of the Mologa, which are incorrectly depicted due to the fact that they did not depict its elbows, but drew it straight, and which ended up there in the Pskov region. Above the upper reaches of the Mologa, right on top of the forests, Veliky Novgorod is written in large. It is clear that the people who made this map, firstly, put the name Veliky Novgorod later, because the forests were rubbed out there and this inscription was on top. This is an engraving. Engravings can be edited. An engraving is an impression from an engraving board on which an image is cut. If desired, you can sand the board in some place and cut out another image there. On the print, it will look as if the pencil drawing was wiped off and something else was added in this place. And that’s what we do see on the map of 1557. Why was it done and who benefited from it? We talk in detail about falsifications in historical science that have significantly influenced our understanding of the past. According to the authors of the New Chronology, until the 17th century, the entire civilized world was united within the framework of a single huge state. At the beginning of the 17th century, it collapsed and many independent small states arose on its ruins. Then a deliberately distorted version of the chronology was developed, what is now called the Scaliger-Petavius version. On its basis, a modern history textbook subsequently arose. Our methods have discovered that in the teaching of Scaliger-Petavius there are shifts, I repeat, three hundred years upwards, 1000, 1800 years upwards, closer to us. In other

words, it turned out that there are repetitions in this textbook, there are duplicates. No need to think that these are real repetitions, duplicates in the real life of peoples, nations and states; this is not so. Apparently, repetitions arose due to the fact that in the 17th century, chronologists, creating a global version of the chronology and the history based on it, had several versions of old chronicles written by different people, in different languages, in different countries. In fact, these chronicles should have been put on the time axis one on top of the other, that is, without shifting them in time. Then, as we understand today, a correct history textbook would have emerged. Anatoly Fomenko and Gleb Nosovsky offer their own version of world history, which, at first glance, may seem fantastic. In brief, this is their version. Known in school textbooks, the Mongol Empire, the Empire of Charlemagne, the Great Islamic Caliphate, the Great Celestial Empire, the Roman and Persian Empires are all different names for the same realm. The authors of the New Chronology call it Russia-Horde. This Great Empire existed on the territory of Eurasia, North Africa, and then America in the era of the 13th-16th centuries. Then the Great Empire collapsed. In Russia, the collapse of the Empire is known as the Time of Great Troubles, in the West as the era of the Reformation. It was a time of furious wars, the curve-up of the Empire's inheritance, the redistribution of borders. The people who seized power on the ground were afraid of rise of the former center of the Empire of Vladimir-Suzdalian Russia. Therefore, by joint efforts they tried to trample down Russia, to erase historical memory of its great past. For this purpose, a version was created according to which the old centers of world domination were located in completely different places, and not in Russia. The deprivation of historical memory of such important imperial centers, which, as they perfectly understood, being defeated, nevertheless raised their heads and tried to restore their former power, because they felt offended, destitute and understood their fate as injustice. They were so powerful and strong in the past, and now they are humiliated. The natural desire of the population, especially the energetic population, is to restore its former power. The idea was to deprive these centers of their true history and declare that these ancient capitals, in fact, are in completely different places. And for this, they usually chose some backwoods or places convenient for themselves, which they were going to make the new capitals. And in the devastated old centers, they planted belief that these were ordinary, unremarkable and meaningless places in history. It worked very effectively and, in particular, this was applied to Veliky Novgorod. Created in the seventeenth century, the new historical science became the most important instrument of the ideological struggle. It did make Veliky Novgorod a small provincial town. In the following centuries, Scaliger's version of history was strongly supported and developed. Historians, including Russian ones, are still doing this and most often, without even suspecting who, when and why directed them along this path. The Romanovs played a big role in this ideological war against Russia. Once in power, from the very beginning they behaved as if they were foreign henchmen on the Russian throne. To erase the traces of the Empire, monasteries were destroyed, libraries were burned, ancient chronicles were destroyed, tombstones and frescoes were knocked down. Go to our famous Andronikov Monastery of the Saviour of present days. In the center there is a cathedral. This is one of the oldest cathedrals in Russia. The monastery is connected with the history of the Battle of Kulikovo, as we now well understand. The interior of this cathedral makes a staggering impression. Its plaster was knocked down, knocked down barbarously, persistently. There are traces of a chisel and a hammer on the stone. They knocked everything down clean, and then they didn’t even bother painting new frescoes. The top was painted with lime. All these facts take on a new meaning; it becomes clear that these are not just traces of restoration activities, but traces of a global

cleansing of the Russian history. Traces of creating a new version. Traces of destruction of the memory of Russia's past. What was on these frescoes? These frescoes, as we understand nowadays, depicted the history of the Great Mongol Empire, the history of Russia-Horde. There were obviously the titles of the kings-khans, which were later wiped out from the pages of our chronicles and, for sure, their presence on the frescoes has now become unconditionally unacceptable. There were obviously symbols, which also now contradict the new Romanovs' version. And so, according to the authors of the New Chronology, the Great Empire, that made up half the world, ended up under the pen of falsifiers of history and, as a result, was completely forgotten. An effective method of destroying historical memory is well known to those who seized power by force. Erase pride in the great past of the country and such a people can be easily controlled. The analysis of chronicles and other documents of the past, carried out by mathematicians Anatoly Fomenko and Gleb Nosovsky, proves that the currently accepted version of history is far from the truth. You can argue or agree with them, but the main thing that the authors of the New Chronology call for is to restore the truth about our history.

## Kulikovo field. Battle for Moscow

The history textbook for grade 5, accepted for study in high school, reads: "The Battle of Kulikovo took place in September 1380 on a wide field at the confluence of the Don and Nepryadva rivers between the troops of Moscow Prince Dmitry Ivanovich and the ruler of the Golden Horde of the Tatar temnik (warlord) Mamai. As a result of a bloody battle, Prince Dmitry, nicknamed Donskoy by his contemporaries, won. This victory put an end to the Tatar-Mongol yoke in Russia. Everything is simple and clear. The time and place of action are marked. The participants are named. One last thing that needs to be done is to go to the Tula region, where the Kulikovo field is located, and see this famous place with your own eyes. But what will we find there? Apart from the obelisk, erected in the middle of the 19th century, there is nothing to see there. No churches to the glory of victory, no burial mounds where the participants in the battle are buried, nothing. Certainly, more than 600 years is a long time. Mounds could be leveled and churches destroyed. Maybe there is something in the ground? After all, something must remain after the battle, in which tens of thousands of people died on both sides. And it is very important to note that not only those arrowheads were found there and presented. Perhaps there are two the most convincing and serious, should I say, finds. First, a plate from the Golden Horde plate armor was found, and then, a year later, 40 meters from this place, a fragment of about 8 rings, such a trim, so to speak, of ancient Russian chain mail was found. They put on such things only for a fight, just before a battle. In everyday life, such things were not subject to seven-day wear. Because they were expensive, and because they were, in fact, heavy. Since 1982, archaeologists have been continuously working on the field and there were just two serious finds. Historians explain: any metal in those days was extremely valuable, so that most of the weapons and armor could be collected and immediately taken away from the battlefield; some later. For such a long time some items rusted and completely decomposed. In addition, scientists refer to imperfection of the modern search methods. The important point here is that in a year we cover no more than 10 hectares with help of metal detectors. And to date, a very, very modest territory has been covered. And what about the remains of dead warriors? After all, the place

of the battle should be literally littered with human bones. As the chronicles say, the bodies of enemies were not buried; foreigners remained to lie where they died. Our expedition together with geophysicists, conducted geophysical research and found a very serious anomaly in all physical parameters, similar to a mass grave. But when we started working on this site, we were simply forced to stop working, since these works fell on a burial site of the years 20-30s of our century. Summarize. At the site of the great battle, several items that were part of the warrior's equipment were found. Plus arrowheads that could have belonged to ordinary hunters. Plus some geophysical anomaly, whose nature is generally unknown. And that's all! How to explain such meager results? There can be only 2 explanations: either scientists searched badly, or they searched in a wrong place. It is difficult to agree with the first, with the second it is even more difficult, since it is known from school where the battle took place. But what about the facts? Let's try to figure it out. When and where did the mention of the battle on the Kulikovo field first appear? This is what Russian chronicles tell us, or rather, their copies, which have come down to us in a greatly distorted form. Here is what is written in the poetic story Zadonshchina, in the earliest chronicle dedicated to the Battle of Kulikovo. To be a knock and a great thunder on the river Nepryadva, between the rivers Don and Dnieper. The field Kulikovo shall be covered with human corpses. To bleed the Nepryadva River. It is curious that until the nineteenth century no one tried to look for the place of the battle. It was discovered in 1820 by a certain landowner Nechayev, who, having read the chronicles, compared names of the rivers and decided that it was right here that Russian soldiers fought with the Tatars. Needless to say that the Kulikovo field was located just on the territory of his estate. Academic science surprisingly quickly recognized Nechayev's sensational discovery. However, how reasonable is the assumption that it was right in these regions that the troops of Prince Dmitry Ivanovich and Khan Mamai met in a bloody slaughter? Let's go back to the original sources. Among the names mentioned in the annals, Don and Nepryadva are especially common. These 2 rivers merge south of Moscow in the Tula region. The upper reaches of the Don, the mouth of the Nepryadva and the Razdolnoye field. This geographical triangle hypnotizes historians who study the circumstances of the Battle of Kulikovo so much that they simply do not notice other references to the area. If we take a look today at the Kulikovo field near Tula, then we will not find almost anything of these names there. Obviously, the Don River flows there and there is a river called Nepryadva. An interesting question is when it got this named. Because on really old maps of the 17th century and in old texts of the 17th-18th centuries, we did not find an indication that the Nepryadva River was there. So, indeed, this river has been known since the time of Nechayev. In addition, big problems arise in identifying the Red Hill, which is repeatedly mentioned in the primary sources. Meanwhile, it is not at all a minor detail. It was on this hill that the headquarters of the Horde army was located. It was from here that Mamai, together with the three princes, led the actions of his warriors. In the vicinity of the Kulikovo field in the Tula region, historians managed to find one small hill. However, firstly, it obviously is rather small in size, and secondly, it would turn out to be a very poor place for the location of a military headquarters. To call this small elevation a hill would simply be against the rules of the Russian language. From which, by the way, it was impossible to observe the battle. Because if the battle took place at the confluence of today's Don and today's Nepryadva, then, being on the Red Hill on this elevation, you could not even see anything even with binoculars, not to mention the fact that there were no binoculars at that time. If the mountain will not come to Mohammed, Mohammed must go to the mountain. That is, if that elevation is too far from the intended place of the battle, then the place itself needs to be moved

closer. This elegant solution looks quite logical and removes some contradictions, but immediately generates others. This is far enough from the confluence of the Don and Nepryadva. Meanwhile, in the chronicles it is directly stated and, in addition, for example, in the Illustrated Chronicle of Ivan the Terrible it is clearly depicted that the battle took place exactly at the confluence of the Nepryadva River with the Don. The further we dig into geography and history, the more inconsistencies we will find. Today's Kulikovo field and its vicinity bear little resemblance to those places that were described in the Zadonshchina (The region beyond the Don River) and other documents that have come down to us. If we also take into account absence of serious material evidence, then a logical question arises: “So, maybe the landowner Nechayev was mistaken and it was a wishful thinking on his part? Maybe representatives of traditional science hurried to recognize his discovery? But if not here, then where? Where to look for traces of the great battle? It would seem that in the annals there is one geographical reference, which should not raise any doubts. This is river Don. And it is quite logical to look for the Kulikovo field on the banks of this Russian river, in places where small tributaries flow into it. But it turns out that not everything is so simple here either. Indeed, in many Slavic languages, DON is not a proper name, but an outdated synonym for the word RIVER. And this is clearly seen from the names of the largest rivers. This is the Don, the modern Don, Quiet Don, a quiet river. This is the Dnieper that is the Easy Don. This is the Dniester that is the Streamy Don. This is the Danube. And so on and so forth. The root DON is everywhere here. Now the circle of search has expanded significantly. On the other hand, it is clear that the battle could not take place at a considerable distance from Moscow. According to the chronicles, the soldiers of Dmitry Donskoy left the Kremlin on August 9, 1380 and were on the road for no more than a month. On horseback and on foot, with full armament, they simply could not go far. Russian scientists Anatoly Fomenko and Gleb Nosovsky have developed a very unusual theory that offers a fresh look at many events in the world and national history. One of their major studies is dedicated to the Battle of Kulikovo. Studying old documents, they stumbled upon a curious mention in the so-called Arkhangelsk Chronicle, dated 1402. The manuscript tells how the residents of ancient Moscow received the icon of the Virgin of Vladimir. “And having brought the icon and met Metropolitan Cyprian with many people on the field of Kulichkovo.” The very expression "field of Kulichkovo", naturally, is very much in common with the Kulikovo field. It is, in general, just the same. And, sure, we couldn’t help but pay attention to such a statement of the chronicler. We knew perfectly well that historians and archaeologists had big problems with the Kulikovo field near Tula. Well, that is, the place that now is considered the site of the Battle of Kulikovo. And, naturally, we were very interested in this testimony. Kulikovo field, more correctly, Kuligovo, means "far field". Now we have such a name in Moscow too. This is Koolishki. At the place where Solyanka is now. Let us outline the circle of names associated with Koolishki in the center of Moscow. The Church of All Saints at Koolishki. Slavyanskaya Square. Solyanka — former Koolishki. The Nativity of the Virgin Mary Church at Koolishki. St. Peter and St. Paul's Church at Koolishki. The Three Holy Hierarchs Church at Koolishki. Former Koolish gates. An impressive space that would fit two huge troops. So, we found a wide field. Now let's see if two rivers, large and small, merge in the immediate vicinity. As you might guess, the Moscow River is quite suitable for the role of Don. But what about Nepryadva? It is not on the maps of the capital city. Meanwhile, it is one of the most important geographical landmarks in the annals dedicated to the Battle of Kulikovo. Maybe again one should take a closer look at the name. Nepryadva means not overflowing, limited by something. And next to the capital's Koolishki, a small tributary flows into

the Moscow River, whose name is the Yauza. In essence, the name Yauza, is about the same as Nepryadva, but said differently. Because the Yauza is a narrowed river, as if bonds were put on it. That is, the river is somehow constrained, from the word "bonds" (oozie in Russian), narrowed. Perhaps it did not overflow; some of its banks were strengthened. Kulichkovo field is the confluence of the Moscow River and the Yauza. New geographic triangle. What is it, a mere coincidence or something more? To confirm or refute the arisen guesses, we turn to the primary sources and consider the chronology of events. As already mentioned, Dmitry Donskoy with his army went on a campaign on August 9, 1380. The route of his movement is quite detailed. “That was a terrifying spectacle. Shouted and yelled and cried all the people of Moscow. The great prince Dmitry let his brother Vladimir go to Brashev road, and he himself went to the Kotel...” Let's take a look at the map. According to the accepted version, Dmitry Ivanovich leaves the Kremlin and moves his troops to Kolomna, which is 100 kilometers from Moscow. Moreover, Vladimir Ahndreévich, the cousin of the Grand Duke, goes along the so-called Brashev road, and for some reason Dmitry himself turns onto the southern Serpukhov road, which passes through the village of Kotly and along which the Grand Duke will never be able to get to Kolomna. Academic science interprets this misunderstanding as a chronicler's mistake. We know that Kol’omenskoyé is located in the south of Moscow. Then he went to Kotly. Lower Kotly is not far from Kol’omenskoyé. At this time, Mamai is at Kuzmin Gat, on the other side of the river. And this is Kuzminki. They are really on the other side of the river, and the relative location is exactly as indicated in the annals. And if you send the prince's troops not from the Kremlin to Kolomna, but in a completely different way. From the village of Kol’omenskoyé to the nowadays center of Moscow. To the place where, according to our assumptions, the Kulikovo field could be located. Then there is no contradiction. The Grand Duke is moving along the Horde road, also known as Kolomenskaya, where there is the Kotlovka River and now the Nizhnie (Lower) Kotly railway station is located. And the regiments of Vladimir Ahndreévich are moving along the Borovsk road. Now it is Borovskoyé Highway. To get to Koolishki, Russian troops had to cross the Moscow River. Either in the area where the Novodevichiy Convent is located these days, or a little further north. Let us turn again to the annals to see if there are any mentions of this. The manuscript says: really there was a crossing, and immediately after that, Dmitry arranged something like a military review. “The next morning, the Great Prince ordered all the soldiers to go to the field to Devicho. More than 150 thousand soldiers joined the ranks, and Dmitry saw such a large militia with spiritual joy ...” And indeed, Devichye Polé (Maidens' Field) is located in Moscow. There is the Novodevichiy Convent. And earlier there was just a Devichiy (Maiden) Convent in a slightly different place, well, approximately in the same place. This means that the names of the streets still remain the same; “Passage of the Devichyie Polé”. Then, there is the Brashev road, along which Vladimir Ahndreévich approached. It corresponds to the Borovskaya road on the Moscow map. The time of a bloody battle is inevitably approaching. Russians and Mongol-Tatars are closing in; they go towards their fate, death or glory. September 5, 1380, three days before the beginning of the battle, Mamai with his army finds himself on Kuzmin Gati. We will not find such a name on the map of the Tula version of the Kulikovo field. However, it is too early to talk about another mistake of the chroniclers. Let's look at the map of Moscow first. No need to be a historian to suggest that, perhaps, Kuzmin Gati is the well-known metropolitan Kuzminki District. Here the Moskva River overflowed, forming a swamp. The troops of Grand Duke Dmitry and Mamai stood in close proximity to each other, but they were separated by impenetrable swamps. Therefore, the opponents were forced to continue moving north

in search of a convenient place to fight. The last night before the battle. In these anxious hours, as the chronicles say, the Russian troops receive a good sign. “A certain man, named Foma Hitsébeév, was placed as a watchman by the Grand Duke on the Chura Mihailov River. And God assured him and revealed to him to see a great vision in the night. Two young men came. Their bright faces shone like the sun. In their hands they held sharp swords.” The next morning, Foma told Dmitry about his insight, who regarded this as the appearance of the holy martyrs Boris and Gleb and began to pray for their help. And the morale of the Russian troops was even more strengthened. Today, not many Moscow old-timers know that the small river Chura flows not far from the Danilov Monastery. It has become shallow, and you can see it only after passing through the old Tatar cemetery. Curiously, Miihailovo is mentioned in the annals. And next to Chura in Moscow there is a bunch of Miihaiylovsky streets. This circumstance is hardly a coincidence. Most likely, there used to be a village with a similar name. As for the generally recognized Kulikovo field and its surroundings, there is no Chura river flowing through Miihailovo there. Another argument in favor of the Moscow version. September 8, 1380. The date known today to every school student; the day of the Battle of Kulikovo. Russians and Mongol-Tatars are separated by a wide field and either by the Nepryadva River, or by the Yauza. Mamai and his headquarters were located on Red Hill. As we could see, a small elevation, discovered in the Tula region, to put it mildly, is not a very good place for coordinating hostilities. In modern topography of Moscow, with its high-rise buildings and straight avenues, it is difficult to see hills and depressions, but six centuries ago, the current Tahganskaya Square was the highest place in the center. Today, this hill has no name, but in ancient times it could well be called red, that is, beautiful, distinguished by its size. Like echoes of those times, geographical landmarks that have survived to this day: Krasnoholmsky embankment, Krasnoholmsky bridge. Is it really again a pure coincidence or such a number of coincidences already allows us to talk about patterns? There are other high hills not far from the Kremlin. From one of them, Dmitry Donskoy could direct maneuvers of his troops. As for the field near Tula, there is no position at all for Dmitry Donskoy's headquarters. There is no even an elevation similar to the alleged Red Hill, which they present as Mamai's headquarters. Therefore, historians hold onto the opinion that Dmitry Donskoy did not have a headquarters. He went, he gave his armor to someone else, and he went there himself to fight. Thus, it turns out that the army of Dmitry Donskoy, according to their version, as a matter of fact fought like a mob by itself without a uniform command, without a uniform headquarters. And yet, they won such a colossal battle. But it looks like a fairy tale, to be honest. The battle opened with a single combat between two champions, Peresv'et and Chelubéy. “A huge Tatar came out of the great Tatar regiment. Seeing him, monk Alexander Peresv'et rode out of the Russian regiment and said: 'This man is looking for his equal. I want to meet him.' And he mounted his horse and rushed at the Tatar. And they hit hard with spears, and broke the spears, and both fell from their horses to the ground dead, and their horses fell.” And then the rest of the warriors joined in. According to the chroniclers, the battle lasts all day. By evening, both troops are suffering heavy losses. Exhausted, bleeding warriors already hardly hold swords in their hands, but still fight for life and death. It seemed that luck was turning away from the Russians. They have to retreat. A bit more and the outlanders will be able to turn the tide of battle in their favor. But at this decisive moment, soldiers from the regiment of Prince Vladimir Ahndreévich appear on the Kulikovo field, who were hiding in ambush for several hours. “They left the green oak forest. As skilful falcons struck the flocks of cranes. The wicked saw them and said: 'We have been outwitted. The worst fought with us, but the valiants survived'”. Let's check if there

is a suitable place for an ambush on the field, which today is considered Kulikovo. Gully Green oak forest. It is right there. The Green Oak Forest itself does not exist. During the time of Peter the Great, when he visited these places, during the construction of the flotilla, he saw those very oaks and ordered these oaks to be marked in order to be preserved for posterity. Oaks disappeared by the 19th century, but the gully, where this oak forest was, it has retained its name to this day, it is there. But, by all means, one has to try hiding there. There's a small oak grove there, right on the battlefield, well, a bit of a narrow strip of trees. And in this narrow strip, a large enough ambush to defeat Mamai's army allegedly hid. Well, Mamai and his commanders must be completely blind not to see such a large enemy unit that is hiding among a few oak trees, well, right in plain sight. It turns out that the Mamai's solders were very unprofessional military men. On the other hand, chronicles say that Mamai's army was exceptionally professional and very powerful. A monument to the event that decided the outcome of the great battle has been preserved in Moscow. The Church of St. Vladimir in the Gardens still stands at Koolishki. The name speaks for itself. And there is every reason to believe that the place for the construction of such a monument was not chosen by chance. The warriors of Mamai pressed the troops of Dmitry Donskoy and went forward, approximately to Slavyanskaya Square. And then, from the hill that descends from the church of St. Vladimir, this is where the monastery of St. John is now, Vladimir Ahndreévich's ambush hit them in the rear. This hill descends to Koolishki with its southern slope. The southern slopes of the hills were always heavily overgrown, and subsequently gardens were planted there. Hence the name Starosadsky Lane. On such a large and densely overgrown hill, the soldiers of Vladimir Ahndreévich could be hiding; moreover, they were at a height and rather far away. Namely, the very famous ambush that struck in the rear just as the Mamai's soldiers advanced towards Red Square. And then they were smashed and pressed against the Yauza, against the Moscow River. There, many drowned and were driven on. Further, according to Nosovsky and Fomenko, the Mongol-Tatars were defeated and pressed against the Yauza or the Moscow River. Trying to cross to the other side, many of them drowned. And those who survived, just fled from the battlefield. Thus, the great battle ended with the unconditional victory of the Russian army. In fact, old images portray the Kulikovo field as being surrounded by hills. Mamai sits on a hill, Vladimir Ahndreévich's ambush hid on another hill; Dmitry's headquarters is on one more hill. There are many of these hills around Koolishki. This is Tag'hansky Hill, going up to the St. Vladimir's Church. This is the hill on which Red Square is located. These are all hills descending to the confluence of the Yauza and the Moscow River. And at this confluence, such a low-lying area arises, in fact, that was the place of the battle. Sure, this is impressive that there is such an ideal correspondence between Moscow geographical names and Kulikovo, taken from the chronicles. And when we encountered this, we were also amazed at the degree of preservation of Moscow names that speak of the Battle of Kulikovo and those mentioned in the annals. Seven ancient churches today surround Moscow's Koolishki at the confluence of the Yauza with the Moscow River. The Church of All Saints at Koolishki, built in memory of the fallen on September 8, 1380. The Church of St. Cosmas and Damian founded under Dmitry Donskoy. The Three Holy Hierarchs Church at Koolishki. St. Peter and St. Paul's Church at Koolishki. The Church of the Life-Giving Trinity. The Nativity of the Virgin Mary Church at Koolishki. In addition, already mentioned the Church of St. Vladimir in the Gardens and the Nativity of the Virgin Mary Church in the Kremlin, founded by Grand Duchess Evdokia in honor of her husband's victory. We have listed only the surviving spiritual monuments, but how many of them have sunk into oblivion. How can the Tula region boast of such a variety of

temples lit by the flames of the great Kulikovo battle? The victory, of course, was unconditional. However, a high price had to be paid. “We don’t have 40 boyars of Moscow, and 12 princes of Belozersky, and 13 boyars-posadniks (mayor) of Novgorod, and 35 boyars of Vladimir, and 40 boyars of Murom ... But young people can’t be counted.” The words of the legend sound like a death knell and another quote. “The great prince stood up in the middle of the field and said, weeping and sobbing: ‘Brothers, now let’s do this. Everyone will bury his neighbor.’ For eight days they stood on the Don, until they separated the Christian bodies from the unholy. The bodies of Christians were buried in the ground; the unholy bodies were thrown to the beasts and birds to be torn to pieces.” In total, 12 Russian princes, 483 boyars and tens of thousands of ordinary soldiers died in the Battle of Kulikovo. And we again come back to the question, where are the remains of the dead heroes buried, if they were not found in the Tula region? Since the battle took place on the Marymas, the Birth of the Virgin Mary, then, in theory, the Nativity of the Virgin Mary temple should have been built at the burial site. A church with this name can be found today in Moscow on the territory of the Simonov Monastery, founded, by the way, in 1379, just on the eve of the Battle of Kulikovo. Moreover, information has been preserved that it is here that the graves of the Russian heroes Peresv’et and Oslyabya are located. According to documents that have been known since the time of Kahramzin, it is well known that Oslyabya and Peresv’et were buried precisely on the territory of the Simonov Monastery. And initially on their grave there was a tombstone laid in the 14th century, on which some inscriptions were made. The history of this tombstone, as well as the burial as a whole, is very mysterious, foggy and interesting. Kahramzin also noted that he was not familiar with the text on the tombstone of Oslyabya and Peresv’et. In general, there are many tragic pages in the history of the Nativity of the Virgin Mary Church. This is an 18th century drawing. It clearly shows that the former appearance of the temple is significantly different from present-day. The church was rebuilt in the nineteenth century. Probably, during the reconstruction, inscriptions and frescoes telling about the Mamai battle could have been destroyed if they were different from the official account. In 1870, a cast-iron tombstone was installed on the graves of Peresv’et and Oslyabya. But this tombstone was not so lucky either. In 1928, the territory of the Simonov Monastery was absorbed by the Dynamo plant. The temple was closed, and the tomb was sold as scrap metal for 317 rubles 25 kopecks. The information that the graves of these famous warriors are in Moscow is not refuted by academic science, but it gives its own explanation to this fact. Allegedly, the bodies of Peresv’et and Oslyabya were merely transported from the Tula region to Moscow and buried here in the capital-city. Perhaps they did the same with the noble dead heroes, of which, we recall, there were about 500. However, firstly, it is not clear how the bleeding Russian troops could carry out such a large-scale transportation. Secondly, the living buried the dead for eight days and only then went to Moscow, three hundred kilometers from the alleged battlefield. Really, the remains of the dead have not been buried for several weeks? Their bodies were poured with honey; somehow, they were taken away. I would say they were making ridiculous manipulations. After all major battles the burial is always on the battlefield. However, let us again come back to the Simonov Monastery. If the graves of Peresv’et and Oslyabya are really located here, then maybe it makes sense to look for the burial places of other participants in the battle? In 1996, it was decided to dig a cellar for household needs on the territory of the monastery. However, the work was stopped as soon as it began, as the diggers stumbled upon a massive accumulation of fragments of human skeletons. There were so many horrifying finds that they could hardly fit in a huge wooden box. The workers who dug this cellar explained to us that the bones were in complete

disarray. One skeleton was upside down. That is, this is clearly not a monastery burial, in which, firstly, there could not be so many bones in one place. Then, they had to lie more consistently. There would be coffins or remains of coffins. No, it was a chaotic huge accumulation of skeletons. And, moreover, another striking thing that drew their attention, it was that the skulls were young. They had all teeth, not worn out, meaning that these were young healthy people when they died. All this suggests that this is really a military burial place. In addition, in the ground a few similar tombstones were found with the same unusual pattern. Now it is hard to recollect the total number, but we personally saw the remains of 5 or 6 tombstones, which are still kept on the territory of the Simonov Monastery. Of these, some are split, but some are quite well preserved. One such tombstone lies right in the center of the monastery. And what struck us was what we saw on them, at that time it was a completely new to us, interesting and previously unfamiliar symbol, this is a forked cross. In the 12th and 16th centuries crosses in many ways were different from what we see today. The most typical were images of the holy cross in form of the modern letter T and in form of the letter GAMMA. Apparently, they simulated the old form of crucifixion. Then, in the era of the Romanovs, when a religious reform was carried out, customs, rituals, and religious symbols themselves were partly changed, these forms of crosses became a thing of the past. Another discovery was made in the center of Moscow. In the middle of the 18th century, at Koolishki, a stone building of an orphanage was built on the personal order of Catherine the Great. The imposing building occupied an area of about 15 hectares. During the Patriotic War of 1812, the French set up here a hospital for their soldiers. And today the Peter the Great Military Academy is located in this building. When I was a cadet, the detachment in which I studied participated in cleaning consequences of a certain housekeeping accident. A wall in the basement broke through. All the dirt, slush poured inside. As always, they threw cadets for purging, with shovels and hand-barrows. And the cadets discovered that all this was quite thickly mixed with human bones. This fact did not remain, of course, in the dark. We talked about it with our academic historians. We had an extensive history course at the academy. This fact was immediately made public. However, historians, for some reason, were not interested. They stated without a shadow of a doubt: "Most likely, the cadets stumbled upon remains of the French, who died of wounds in 1812." From the information that is available. In a wasteland near the Kitay-gorod wall, that is, outside the territory of the modern academy, even if they were buried somewhere on the territory of the academy, then not under the very foundations. In fact, it broke right through the interior, that is, the bones are located directly under the building itself, which had already stood for more than 50 years at the time of the war of 1812. None of the representatives of academic science has bothered to check what kind of mass graves are located under the foundation of the former orphanage and on the territory of the Simonov Monastery. Or, at least, find out what era these necropolises belong to. Unfortunately, there is no talk today about systematic excavations in the center of the capital-city. Such work is quite difficult to organize, and it will be expensive. But archaeological research in the center of Moscow, in the Koolishki region, is almost the only chance to find out the truth. Now scientists can only put forward versions and speculate based on inferences, since the documents and evidence that have come down to us have been subjected to numerous revisions, many primary sources have been lost, and some have been deliberately destroyed. According to Nosovsky and Fomenko, purposeful work on a total revision of national history began in the 17th century as part of the so-called reformist activities of the first representatives of the Romanov dynasty. Our experience with old monuments shows that the old tombstones in Russian history before the 17th century are basically

almost all destroyed. They all perished and died because they had symbols that were rejected by the Romanovs, replaced by them with the new symbolism of the reformist time of the seventeenth century. And in order to remove these traces as much as possible, in particular, a large-scale campaign was undertaken to destroy old tombstones. As part of this campaign, most likely, the tombstone of Oslyabya and Peresv'et was destroyed. You haven't shaved off your beard yet, have you? In Europe they laugh at beards. Such large-scale transformations could have been caused both by religious motives and by the desire to bring Russian historical science in line with new Western standards. Allegedly, in Russia before the era of Peter the Great, in general, before the era of the Romanovs, there was no cartography of its own. Existing maps, maps of Moscow are made by foreigners. Sigismund's plan, plans and maps of O'Leary and other travelers who were in Moscow before the 17th century are known. However, for some reason, today we don't see old Russian maps. True, they refer to the supposedly existed Godunov drawing. The plan made under Godunov. But it hasn't survived. Old documents, old maps, first of all, of the Russian-Horde Empire, apparently, often unconditionally contradicted the new Romanov version. Because they depicted the geography of Russia, the geography of Europe, the geography of the world, which was at odds with the new geography created in Western Europe by the Scaliger school and in our country by the Romanov school of historians. If a global historical cleansing was really carried out, then a natural question arises. It may be that not only information about the place of the Battle of Kulikovo and the burial places of fallen soldiers turned out to be distorted. Perhaps it is worth taking a closer look at other details of events hidden from us in the depths of centuries. It's possible that in this case we are in for unexpected results. The Yaroslavl Museum keeps an old icon dating back to the middle of the 17th century. A unique image of the Battle of Kulikovo. We do not know for how many centuries this image has lain in oblivion. According to the technology of icon painting, the image was covered with drying oil, which had properties of gradually darkening. Approximately after 100 years, an icon without restoration became completely black and a new one was painted on top of the disappeared image, which did not always coincide with the previous one. When in the 20th century they learned how to remove old layers using chemicals, many initial stories were revealed. The same thing happened with this icon. Only in 1959 the image of the Battle of Kulikovo was revealed. The masterpiece of Yaroslavl painting will tell a lot of interesting things to an attentive and unbiased eye. Here are the troops of Mamai crossing the river, descending from a high hill. There are no such height differences on the plains of the Tula region. But the Red Hill in Moscow exactly matches the image of the icon painter. But the most intriguing thing is that on the Yaroslavl icon there are no significant differences between the Tatar and Russian troops. The same faces, the same colors. And on these colors is the image of the Vernicle, who since time immemorial was considered the patron of Russian soldiers. According to our reconstruction, there were both Russians and Tatars on both sides. In general, at that time there was no division into nations in the modern sense, it was all mixed up and more unified. And we see that these old images convey a completely different version of history than the one we know today from textbooks of the Romanovs' history. Moreover, some documents say that the Volga Tatars were reluctant to serve Mamai and there were few of them in his army. And the Poles, Crimeans, Jász, Kassogs and Genoese fought for Mamai, who were also involved in the financial support of his campaign. Meanwhile, the baptized Tatars, along with the Lithuanians, fought on the side of Dmitry. As you know, the army of Mamai is called a horde. However, the Russian army is also called exactly the same. Here is a quote from Zadonshchina. "Why are you, filthy Mamai, encroaching on the Russian land? Didn't the Zalessky

horde beat you?” The Vladimir-Suzdalian principality was called the Zalessky land. So maybe the word "horde" simply means an army, and not the Tatar hordes, as we used to understand? But who then, in reality, was Mamai? According to the chronicle, he was a temnik (captain of 10 000) or a tiysyatsky (captain of 1000), that is, a military leader. A few years before the Battle of Kulikovo, he betrays his khan and tries to seize power. The very similar story happened with Grand Duke Dmitry Ivanovich in Moscow, and it was even taking place at the same time. The son of a tiysyatsky Ivan Veliyaminov, having quarreled with Dmitry, flees to the horde and there he prepares for a campaign against his ruler. It is easy to see that the actions of the tiysyatskis in the history of the Battle of Kulikovo somehow strangely duplicate each other. According to the chronicles, Ivan Veliyaminov, the traitor, who appeared in the Russian land, will be executed right on the Kulikovo field after Dmitry's victory. In memory of this event, the Grand Duke will even order minting of coins. On the coins of Donskoy there was an image of the prince himself, who holds a sword and shield in his hand, and a defeated enemy lies at his feet. It’s a man whose head has been cut off. It is known that Ivan Veliyaminov was executed, his head was cut off. This coin records the fact of Donskoy's victory over his enemy. Dmitry and his opponent with swords in their hands. A few minutes more and a bloody battle will begin, and on the reverse of the coin a man with a shield. But do they hold a shield during an execution? It turns out that tiysyatsky Veliyaminov died on the battlefield. According to the generally accepted version, after defeat, Mamai fled to the steppes and the same year faced a new enemy, Tokhtamysh, the khan of the Zayaiitsky horde. They met on the banks of the Kahlka, where history repeated itself exactly. As on the Kulikovo field, poor Mamai was betrayed by his Lithuanian ally and was defeated. Considering that vowels were not used in the ancient chronicles, the names Kahlka and Kulikovo are not just similar, but absolutely identical and consist of only three letters: K, L and K. In addition, coins have been preserved, on which Khan Tokhtamysh is engraved on one face in Arabic, and on reverse in Russian, Grand Duke Dmitry Donskoy. Historians are trying to explain this by the fact that these coins were minted by Tokhtamysh on one face and by Dmitry Donskoy on the other. In our opinion, this can be explained in a different way, namely, that several languages were used in Russia: Russian, Arabic, Tatar, and on the same coin the name of the same ruler could be minted on both, obverse and reverse, in two different languages. From our point of view there is nothing surprising in this. Therefore, the presence of such coins is a fairly strong argument in favor of the fact that Dmitry Donskoy and Khan Tokhtamysh is the same person. So maybe there were no two different battles that are similar like two peas in a pod? And there was just one on the Kulikovo field, where Prince Dmitry Donskoy, aka the great Khan Tokhtamysh, defeated troops of the traitor Ivan Veliyaminov, also known as Mamai. But in this case, an even more unexpected question arises. Was there ever a Mongol-Tatar yoke? In light of new assumptions, it appears that there was not. But there was a huge Russian-Horde empire, which in the second half of the 14th century was divided into three parts. Golden Horde, White Horde or White Russia and Little Russia, also known as the Blue Horde. The Golden Horde, another name for the Volga kingdom, falls into a long and dangerous turmoil. In 21 years, 25 rulers are replaced. There is a fierce struggle for the throne, which in 1380 is resolved by a grandiose battle on the Kulikovo field. The history of the distant fourteenth century needs further research and, most importantly, search for new documents and material evidence unknown to science. They can confirm or refute the theories that exist today. However, once again, there are undeniable facts. The Battle of Kulikovo really took place. It took place in 1380, and Dmitry Donskoy won it. And, certainly, it is rightfully considered a symbol of courage, valor and honor of

Russian soldiers. And one more interesting detail. In our time, in the center of Moscow on Krasnoho'lmskaya embankment, a cross has been erected; and its granite base has engraving: “A monument to the holy noble prince Dmitry Donskoy, the defender of the Russian land, will be erected at this place. In the summer of 1992 September 25”. Back then the sculptor could not know about the Moscow version of the battle, it was not yet formulated. But it so happened that the memorial cross is right in place where the legendary Kulikovo field could be located.

## Russia-Horde

Everyone seems to be aware of the existence of the Mongol-Tatar yoke. Everyone knows that as a result of a foreign invasion in 1237, for centuries Russia was bogged down in the darkness of poverty, ignorance, cruelty and violence, leading to economic and political dependence on its enslavers, the Mongol khans and the rulers of the Golden Horde. The school history textbook clearly states it. The Mongol-Tatar hordes were wild and nomadic tribes that did not have their own written language and culture. They invaded the territory of medieval Russia on horseback from the distant borders of China, conquered it, and subjected it to slavery for three hundred years from the 13th to the 15th century. It is believed that the Mongol-Tatar invasion brought incalculable troubles to the Russian people. It resulted in huge human losses, destruction and plunder of material and spiritual values, throwing the economic and cultural development of Russia three centuries back in comparison to Europe. Everyone knows about it now. However, was it truly so? American historian Erik Midelfort, working in European archives, uncovered unusual material. It turns out that a strange wave of insanity hit the European nobility in the sixteenth century; moreover, it was indeed in the sixteenth century. Neither before nor after this era was anything like this observed. Midelfort wrote a book called “Mad Princes of Renaissance Germany” on this subject. How did the astonishing epidemic of insanity manifest itself? For example, Albert Frederick, Duke of Prussia, went mad in the following manner. He tore apart portraits of Martin Luther and went to bed in full battle gear, expecting that Prussia would be attacked by hordes of Mongols. Hordes of Mongols in Europe in the 16th century, a hundred years after the end of the Mongol-Tatar yoke in Russia? It looks like he has really gone mad. Modern historians believe that Europe was never conquered by the Mongols. That the forces of the invaders were depleted due to the heroic resistance of the Russian people; thus Russia saved Europe from enslavement. Meanwhile, historians admit that in 1241, as a result of the so-called Western Campaign, the Mongols defeated the army of Henry II the Pious, Duke of Silesia, near Wrocław and invaded Poland, and then Hungary, Moravia, and Silesia. Europe tried to resist, but the unified troops under the command of King Béla IV of Hungary were defeated by Batu Khan. During six days of retreat, most of the troops were vanquished, and the Mongols captured the capital of Hungary, Pest. By 1242, the troops of Batu Khan had already reached the shore of the Adriatic Sea. Lev Gumili'ov, in his book "Ancient Russia and the Great Steppe," provides the following evidence. “Western Europe was in a state of panic. Fear gripped not only Germany, but also France, Burgundy, and Spain, and brought with it a complete stalling of England's trade with the continent. So, who really were the Mongol hordes that so frightened Europe in the sixteenth century? As a real state, Mongolia emerged only in the twentieth century and, even now, it is at a low level of development, including in terms of military art. Perhaps being

a powerful empire in the past, it somehow degraded? There have been such examples in history. For example, the fall of the Babylonian and Roman Empires, the savagery of Europe during the early Middle Ages, and so on. However, there is another perspective. At present, neither ordinary Mongols nor their intellectuals are aware of such an extremely important event for their country as the conquest of Russia and Europe. They learned all of this data from external sources, including Western literature. If this had been such a historical event, then customs, culture, and writing would have remained in Mongolia. Currently, there is nothing of this in Mongolia. Their writing appeared in the twentieth century. It didn't exist before. The typical stereotype theory about the Mongol-Tatar yoke in Russia is not supported by domestic sources, yet it is still effectively taught in schools, often with reference to Russian medieval chronicles. But many historical documents have been preserved that contradict what is taught in schools nowadays. Here, for example, a medieval handwritten article list from the embassy of Tsar Boris Godun'ov to England in 1601-1602 gives a detailed account of the nobleman Grigo'ry Mik'ulin and clerk Ihvan Zinovi'ev. In particular, it contains a conversation between the Russian Ambassador Grigo'ry Mik'ulin and the Scottish Ambassador in London. The ambassador asked Grigo'ry, "How are the Tatars with your great sovereign now?" And Gregory said to the ambassador, “Which Tatars are you asking about? Many Buzurman kings and princes serve our Great Sovereign His Royal Majesty. And many Tatars, people of the kingdoms of Kazan and Astrakhan and Siberia, and Cossack and Kalmyk hordes as well as many other hordes.” As can be seen from the text, the Russian Ambassador Grigo'ry Mik'ulin does not understand the Scottish Ambassador's question. He does not see the Tatars as conquerors of Russia, but rather as warriors in the service of the Russian Tsar. When medieval Western European chroniclers spoke about Russia, they wrote, "Such and such a Moscow sovereign went on with the Tatars on such and such a military campaign." Here is a quote from the book of the Habsburg ambassador to Russia, Baron Sigismund von Herberstein, Notes on Muscovite Affairs, written in the sixteenth century. “In 1527, the Muscovites set out with the Tatars once more, resulting in the well-known Battle of Olshanitsa.” This is a fragment from the German chronicle of 1533." Here is what is said about Ihvan the Terrible: “Ihvan Vasilievich, with his Tatars, took Kazan and Astrakhan into his kingdom.” It turns out that, in the view of medieval Europeans, the Tatars were not conquerors, but warriors of the Russian Tsar. In 1252, the ambassador of King Louis IX of France, William of Rubruck, traveled with his retinue from Constantinople to the headquarters of Batu Khan, who wrote about this in his travel journal. “Everywhere among the Tatars, the settlements of the Russians are scattered. The Russians mingled with the Tatars, adopted their customs, as well as their clothing and way of life. All forms of transportation in the vast country are serviced by the Russians. At the river crossings, the Russians are everywhere.” It is noteworthy that Rubruck traveled across Russia only 15 years after the start of the Mongol-Tatar yoke. Didn't the Russians mix too quickly with the wild Mongols, adopting their clothes, customs, and way of life? Further, Rubruck wrote: "The wives of the Russians, similar to ours, wear jewelry on their heads and trim the hemlines of their dresses with stripes of ermine and other furs. Men wear short clothes, kaftans, chekmenes, and lambskin hats. Women adorn their heads with headdresses similar to those worn by French women. Men wear outerwear like German.” Well! It turns out that the Mongol-Tatar clothing in Russia in those days was no different from Western European outerwear. This drastically changes our understanding of the wild nomadic barbarians from the distant Mongolian steppes. Here is what the Arab chronicler and traveler, Ibn Battuta, wrote about the Golden Horde in his travel notes in 1333. “There were many Russians in the Sarai of Berke. The majority of the

armed, service and labor forces of the Golden Horde were Russian people.” Imagine all the absurdity of the described picture. For some reason, the victorious Mongols armed the Russian slaves they had defeated in battle, and these slaves make up the bulk of their troops, without offering armed resistance. Even in the history of ancient Rome, the victors did not arm the conquered slaves. On the contrary, the victors always disarm the vanquished. If they are later called up for military service, then they are a significant minority, since they are considered to be unreliable. What turns out? Western European chroniclers who visited enslaved Russia idyllically depict Russian people walking around in Tatar costumes, which are not actually different from European ones. And the armed Russian warriors calmly serve the Khan's horde, without offering any resistance. It doesn't look very much like a yoke. Here is a miniature from the Fourteenth Century “Illustrated Chronicle of Ihvan the Terrible”, depicting the battle between the Russians and the Tatars. It is impossible to distinguish Russians and Tatars here. Both have the same helmets, battle armor, sabers, shields, and the Colors. However, on the head of one of the commanders, the Byzantine imperial crown is depicted for some reason, and the other has a Russian princely cap trimmed with fur. Can you say with certainty where the Russian squad is and where the Tatar horde is? No doubt, modern historians can explain this by attributing the ignorance of a medieval artist who painted this miniature not from life, but intuitively. However, it turns out that this artist was not the only one to display Russian and Tatar warriors in this way. On the miniatures of other medieval chroniclers depicting scenes of Russian-Tatar battles, including the famous “The Tale of the Rout of Mamai”, Russians and Tatars are indistinguishable either. But in the miniatures depicting the scenes of the Battle of the Neva from the same “Illustrated Chronicle of Ihvan the Terrible”, the Swedish dog-knights differ from the Russian warriors in the rounded shape of their helmets. So, the artist's ignorance has no bearing on this. In addition, on all Russian medieval miniatures depicting Tatar raids, the Mongol khans, for some reason, are depicted in royal crowns and the chroniclers inexplicably don’t call them khans, but rather kings. Here is another miniature from the same “Illustrated Chronicle of Ihvan the Terrible” from the 14th century. It is called "Batu's Invasion of Russian Cities." Batu-khan is fair-haired with Slavic features, he wears a crown, and his two armor-bearers are typical Zaporozhye Cossacks with topknots on their shaved heads. The rest of the warriors of Batu-khan are no different from the Russian warriors. The exhibition of the art museum of the city of Yaroslavl showcases a large wooden icon from the 17th century depicting the life of St. Sergius of Radonezh. At the bottom of the icon is the legendary Battle of Kulikovo between Russian Prince Dmitry Donskoy and Khan Mamai. No one doubts the authenticity of this historical monument these days. However, Russians and Tatars are indistinguishable on this icon as well. Both sides wear the same gilded armor and helmets. Moreover, both Tatars and Russians fight under the same Holy Colors with an image of the Holy Mandylion. Can you imagine the Tatar horde of Khan Mamai fighting against the Russian warriors of Prince Dmitry Donskoy under the Colors with the face of Jesus Christ? “This is some nonsense,” you might think. And yet it is a fact. It is unlikely that the Russian Church could afford such an oversight in the Orthodox icon. Here is what the medieval authors of the annalistic chronicles “Zadonshchina” (the region beyond the Don River) and “The Tale of the Rout of Mamai” wrote about Mamai's army. “And King Mamai came with ten hordes and seventy princes. It can be seen that the Russian princes gave you a good beating. There are neither princes nor warboss with you. And immediately filthy Mamai fled, weeping, saying bitterly: ‘Brothers, we will not be in our own land and will no longer see our druzh'ina (squad), neither princes, nor boyars.’ Why do you, filthy Mamai, desire the Russian land? In the end, the

Zalessky horde has beaten you. And Mamai's princes, yesa-ools (Cossack captains) and boyars bowed to Tokhtamysh." It turns out that according to the testimony of medieval chroniclers, the horde of Tsar Mamai was referred to as a druzh'ina, within which yesa-ools, princes, boyars, and warboss fought. And the army of Dmitry Donskoy was called the Zalesky Horde. Here is another intriguing document. We learn about the composition of Batu-Khan's army from the letter King Béla IV of Hungary wrote to the Pope of Rome in 1241. "When Hungary was invaded by the Mongols, it was mostly turned into a desert and surrounded by various infidel tribes, such as Russians, Brodnici from the East, Bulgarians, and other heretics from the south…" Excuse me, but where are the Mongols actually here? However, it turns out that the troops of Batu Khan were mainly composed of Slavs, namely Russians, Brodnici, and Bulgarians. Imagine the situation: there is not a single Mongol or Tatar in the horde of the legendary Mongol Batu-Khan. What madness! This Western European miniature from an old handwritten book is, kind of, an illustration of the letter of the Hungarian king. It depicts the battle between the Mongols and the Hungarians on the bridge over the Sha-yoh River. The Mongols look like medieval knights, armed with heavy swords and wearing tightly-closed metal helmets. Who forged these battle swords and armor for them? Aren't Russian skilled gunsmiths? They could hardly make all this in their wild Mongolian steppes. Imagine a horde of thousands moving from Mongolia to Europe through Russia and conquering. In order to supply this army, it is necessary a large quantity of metal. Metal is needed for weapons, including horseshoes. As before, so now in Mongolia there is no ore, no metal, no metal specialists. It turns out that during the time of the so-called Mongol-Tatar invasion, the Horde khans in Russia were called tsars, not khans; and yesa-ools, princes, boyars, and warbosses served in those fighting druzh'inas. And the famous Mongol-Tatar horde, with crooked scimitars, shields, and bows in their hands, terrifying with their sudden massive raids, wild screams and hoots; this is just a myth, a fairy tale, a fable. It is known that the vast Mongol Empire, during its 300-year existence, left behind practically no written sources in the original Mongolian language. Here is what Ohsip Mikhailovich Kovalevskiy, a well-known Russian orientalist and professor at Kazan University, wrote at the end of the nineteenth century in his monograph "History of the Mongols". "From ancient Mongolian written sources, we know only the inscription on the stone from the time, purportedly, of Genghis Khan, recently explained by Schmidt, and letters from Persian kings Arghun and Öljaitü to the French king, also explicated by Schmidt in a brochure published in St. Petersburg in 1824… Additionally, Europe has manuscripts written in Mongolian letters in the Tatar language, such as a translation of the Persian novel Bakhtiyar-nama. These letters remained uncertain for a long time, without a title. Finally, some Orientalists decided to accept the name "Turk Oriental" or "Uyghur" for them... Whoever pays attention to the Uyghurs of Turkestan will take them for Turks... But weren't they a Mongol tribe in ancient times? And is this all that the huge Mongol Empire left behind? An inscription on a stone, a couple of letters, and a novel? Not much, and the novel is written in Tatar; only the letters are Mongolian. And even these meager texts were, it turns out, deciphered by the same person: a certain Mr. Schmidt. For some reason, Turkestan Uighurs are considered descendants of the Mongol conquerors, who are mistakenly thought to be Turks. Only historians know that these Turks once were Mongols. The Turks themselves do not realize this for some reason. It is known that the Mongol khans shaped their decrees into so-called yarlyks (letters of the khans). Judging by the annals, the Mongol Empire should have left us a legacy of a large number of its documents, Mongol yarlyks written in Mongol. However, no such documents have survived. Only a few pieces were found, not in the state historical archives, but in the papers of

Western European historians. At the same time, many yarlyks written by the Crimean khans remain. However, they are not written in Mongolian but in Russian, Tatar, and Italian. This contradicts the traditional history that is accepted today. However, a large number of documents from that period written in Russian have been preserved. Treaties of princes, last wills and testaments, and so on. This means that Russian remained the state language in Russia during the Mongol-Tatar subjugation. From the time of the Golden Horde Khanate, neither Mongolian written documents nor material ones have been preserved. Here is what the famous Russian archaeologist, Vasily Vasilyevich Grigoriev, wrote about this issue in the 19th century in the scientific article, "Four-Year Archaeological Searches in the Ruins of Sahrai'". “The history of the Golden Horde Khanate is one of the most impoverished by time and circumstance: not only did they destroy the most important written documents… they wiped out most of the traces of the Khanate from the face of the earth. Its once flourishing and populous cities lie in ruins... And about the capital of the Horde, the famous Sarai', we do not even know to what ruins its big name could be attributed.” Then Grigoriev continued: “It would seem that the most positive indications of the era of the foundation of Sarai' should be expected from our chronicles... But our chronicles in this case evilly deceive expectations: speaking of the princes going to the Horde or to the Court they do not determine where the Horde was located… In such cases, they simply articulate, "Go to the Horde," and "Come from the Horde," without indicating where exactly the Horde was.” Lev Gumilev also writes about this: “Despite the fact that the problem of the creation and destruction of the power of Genghis Khan has concerned many historians, it has not yet been resolved.” The Mongols were surprised to learn that Genghis Khan had featured in their history. Genghis Khan is not a Mongolian name. They were surprised that Genghis Khan brought great wealth to the territory of Mongolia, including buried treasures. Naturally, Russian expeditions are looking for these treasures, and Mongols are as well, but they have yet to find them due to the fact that there was never a horde, nor Genghis Khan, and thus no treasures. As can be seen, many questions arise regarding the history of the Mongol-Tatar conquest. Why, for example, did a great empire that was in existence for three hundred years leave behind virtually no material monuments? Why did the Mongol khans write their yarlyk-decrees, that is, state documents, in Russian? Could it be that the conquerors of Russia were not the Mongols at all? In the fourteenth-century “Illustrated Chronicle of Ivan the Terrible” the chapter "The Tale of the Rout of Mamai" states, "By God's permission, for our sins, the tsar of the eastern country, named Mamai and a Hellene by faith, has risen at the instigation of the devil." This is a rather unexpected message because Greeks, known as Hellenes, are Christians, as you know. Perhaps a scribe's mistake or a misunderstood word in the original source? Perhaps, however, it turns out that not only the Russian chronicles, but also many European chronicles unequivocally state that the Mongols were Christians. Modern historians often brush aside these testimonies, providing an explanation and often dismissing a discussion with medieval authors as being ignorant. However, many ancient documents testify that the Mongol khans were Christian. For example, in the annals of Burton Abbey from the late 13th century, there is an interesting entry. “When asked about religion, the Tatar replied that they believe in the one Lord of the world. He said “God the Father and His Son are in heaven. Chirkan, that is, Genghis Khan, on Earth.” But the Muslim God, Allah, has no son. Only Christians have Jesus, the Son of God. It turned out that the Tartar, who spoke with the minister of Burton Abbey in Burton upon Trent about his faith, was a Christian. Further, the same source informs: “They say that their leader, Genghis Khan, is St. John.” It turns out that Genghis Khan, according to the testimony of the medieval Tatars, was also a

Christian, since they called him St. John. By the way, the name Genghis Khan means "Great Khan"; this is a title, not a name. Until the 17th century in Russia, in addition to baptismal names, other nicknames were also bestowed. They were used both in everyday life and in official documents. Many of them would sound like Tatar to a modern person's ear. However, in the Middle Ages they were worn by typical Russians. This is confirmed by the well-known research of the historian Evgeny Petrovich Karnovich “Family nicknames and titles in Russia”, 1886. There, in particular, the following is said about this: “Baptismal names in Moscow were very often replaced not only by other Christian ones, but also by Tatar ones. For example, Buhlaht, Murah't, Akhmah't, so that, from such dummy names, semi-patronymics were made, which later turned into generic nicknames of people who were purely Russian in origin.” You can learn about the names of the Horde Tatars before they were baptized using the example of the Verderevskiys’ genealogical book, which was published in 1686. It tells that in 1371, at the request of Oleg 2nd Ivanovich, Grand Prince of Ryazan, the Tatar “Solohkhmir Miroslavov” came to him from the Grand Horde. This Solokhmir was then baptized, and married the daughter of the Grand Prince, laying the foundation for the famous Russian boyar family, the Verderevskys. He got the baptismal name Ihvan. “Ivan Miroslavich (that was the name of the baptized Tatar) had a son Grigory ... Grigory Ivanovich Solokhmir had children: Grigory and Mihailo, nicknames Abumahylo, and Ivan, nickname Kancheiy, and Konstantin, nickname Divnoy.” It turns out that the unbaptized Tatar who had just arrived from the Grand Horde bore, as it turns out, the Slavic pagan name "Solokhmir" (Soloha Mir). And his father, also a Tatar, was called Miroslav, which means “Peace and Glory”, a Slavic name. After being baptized, Solokhmir was given the name Ihvan according to the calendar. However, baptismal names were not used in everyday life at that time, so he and his children, in addition to their baptismal names, also acquired nicknames. His children were given the nicknames Abumahylo, Kancheiy and Divnoy. Among such nicknames, there were many that were perceived by ear as Tatar. For example, Muhrsa, Eppancha, Saltyr, Suleysha, Suhmbur, Suhnbul, Suhryahn, Tashlyk, Timir, Kudiar and so on. In this regard, it can be assumed that the nickname Yehrmak, well-known in Russia, derived from the baptismal name German. The name Batu is derived from the Russian word "batya" which translates to "father" or "dad." The same can be said about the name Mamai; apparently, this is one of the forms of the Russian word for "mother's son". Remember, for example, the legendary Zaporozhian Cossack-Slav named Mamai. So, we have learned that the Western European chroniclers unequivocally tell us about the Christian Tatars and their leader Genghis Khan, as Saint John. The name "Genghis Khan" itself turns out to not be a name at all. This is the title of the Great Khan and Christian names given at baptism in Russia were almost never used in everyday life. Russians in those days had nicknames, sometimes even Tatar or similar to Tatar, so foreigners mistook them for Tatars. What kind of relationship did the Russian Orthodox Church have with the horde during the so-called Mongol-Tatar yoke? It is known that the Church has always called on its congregants to fight against foreign invaders, but during the time of the Mongol-Tatar slavery, no calls were made from the Orthodox Church to the oppressed Russian people. Moreover, from the very first days of the enslavement of Russia, the Church provided all kinds of support to the Pagan Mongols. Historians may object, saying that the church in those days was corrupt, caving in and groveling before the conquerors, like all Russian princes and the entire Russian people. However, was it truly so? Here is what Russian historians wrote about this in the nineteenth century. “During the Tatar-Mongol invasion, an Orthodox church was built at the headquarters of the Khan from the beginning of the formation of the Golden Horde.” As military

settlements were established in the horde, Orthodox churches were erected, clergy were called in, and church hierarchies were established. Metropolitan Kirill moved from Novgorod to Kyiv, where he restored the Metropolia of All Russia. The Metropolitan enjoyed significant benefits from the Mongol authorities. His power was extensive in comparison with the princely. Kahramzin writes about this in his "History of the Russian State". “One of the consequences of Tatar domination was the rise of our clergy, an increase in the number of monks, and the expansion of church estates. The possessions of the church, freed from Horde and princely taxes, prospered. Few of today's Russian monasteries were founded before or after the Tatars. All the others have remained an exemplum to that time.” It turns out that almost all Orthodox Russian monasteries were founded during the Mongol-Tatar yoke. "Incredible!" It is hard to believe, as historians tell us today that churches and monasteries in Russia were plundered, defiled, and destroyed by the Tatars. Near Bakhchysarai, the capital of the medieval Crimean Khanate, the Orthodox Assumption Monastery was built in the early fifteenth century. After the capture of the Crimea by the Turks in 1475, this monastery became the residence of the Metropolitan, the center of Orthodoxy in the region. Here is what the Russian historian of the 17th century, Andrei Ihvanovich Lyzlov, wrote about this in his book, "Scythian History," dedicated to the history of the Kazan Kingdom and the Ottoman Empire. “Once upon a time, the Khan of the Crimea, Haci Giray, fighting against his adversaries, asked for help from the Most Holy Lady Theotokos in the Assumption Monastery, promising a famous offering and honoring her image. And he did so when he returned with profit and victory. After selecting a couple of the best horses, he sold them and purchased wax and candles, enough to last a full year. Even his heirs, the Crimean Khans, did so on many occasions.” Incredible! A Muslim is asking for help from the Orthodox Mother of God. These Mongols are strange conquerors. Instead of destroying and plundering churches and monasteries, as historians claim, they, on the contrary, encouraged their mass construction and entrusted Orthodox church authorities with significant privileges. And, for some reason, they honor the image of the Christian icon of the Mother of God. He lit candles in front of her and, praying, ordered his heirs to do the same. Exploring the cultural heritage of the Russian Middle Ages, it is impossible not to pay attention to some oddities from a modern historical perspective in the handwritten text of the famous literary monument of Afanasiy Nikitin, " A Journey Beyond the Three Seas ". This manuscript begins with the words: " In return for the prayer of our holy fathers, O Lord Jesus Christ, Son of God have mercy on your sinful slave Afanasiy, son of Nikita." It is clear that this text was written by an Orthodox person. Basically, "The Journey" is written in Russian. However, from time to time, Afanasiy Nikitin freely and seamlessly switches to Turkic or even Arabic, and then just as seamlessly returns to Russian. Obviously, he, like his fellow countryman, was fluent in these languages. That, however, is not the point. The main thing is that Afanasiy Nikitin used the Turkic or Arabic language to write Russian Orthodox prayers, or, if you like, Islamic Orthodox prayers, no matter how strange it may sound in our time. Here, for example. “Do not turn me away, Lord, from the true path and guide me, Lord, on your right path ... My Lord, I have already passed four Easters in the Moslem land but I have not forsaken Christianity.” Here, Afanasiy Nikitin, right in the middle of his prayer, switches to Turkic and Arabic, but writes them down using Russian letters. In particular, instead of "God" he writes "Ollo", that is, “Allah”, and so on. Afanasiy Nikitin ended his manuscript with the following words. “By the grace of God, the three seas have passed; O help Thy slave!” Here, Afanasiy Nikitin uses expressions from the Koran such as "Ollo akber", "Allahu akbar", and "Isa ruhollo", which translates to "Jesus, the Spirit of Allah". He does not view this as blasphemy, but as an acceptable

norm. Probably today we do not know something very important about medieval Christianity in Russia. Let us open the foundational publication "The State Kremlin Armoury", which contains photographs and descriptions of valuable items stored in the Kremlin Armoury. Here is the ceremonial damask helmet of the Moscow Tsars, commonly known as the Jericho Cap. The helmet is adorned with precious stones, diamonds, rubies, and emeralds. It is known that the Jericho Cap was made in 1621 by Russian craftsman Nikita Dahvydov, who was the Chief Craftsman of the Moscow Kremlin Armoury. One of the most famous items in the Kremlin Armory is the Jericho cap, a military helmet attributed to Tsar Alexei Mihhailovich. This is a luxurious helmet with typical Orthodox symbols, including the image of the royal crown, the Orthodox cross, and the Archangel Michael. At the same time, this helmet depicts an Arabic inscription, which means "And please the believers", an expression from the Koran. At our request, this inscription was translated by Chernienko, a specialist in Arabic. Russian craftsman Nikita Davydov placed a royal crown and an eight-pointed Orthodox cross, along with Arabic sayings from the Koran, on the Jericho cap. There are no Russian inscriptions on this helmet, which is intended for the Tsar of the Russian Orthodox Church. It turns out that the use of the Tatar Turkic language alongside Russian in everyday life was considered the norm in medieval Russia. The people of Russia at that time also knew the Arabic language. That is why the Arabic script was often used as an ornamental decoration on combat armor and edged weapons. It is interesting to see how the Mongol-Tatar yoke has influenced Russian culture and, in particular, the Russian language. After all, the horde of wild barbarians that flooded Medieval Russia hopelessly corrupted and trampled the primordially Russian language into the mud, plunging the enslaved people into darkness, ignorance, and illiteracy. Cities, Orthodox churches, monastic libraries, ancient books are burning, treasures are being robbed, and things like that. Historians are convinced that the Mongol-Tatar yoke prevented the development of culture in Russia for three centuries, turning the Russian people into ignorant semi-savages. However, for some reason, Kahramzin wrote differently about this time. “Our language from the 13th to the 15th century acquired more purity and correctness. Instead of the uneducated Russian dialect, the writers carefully adhered to the grammar of church books or ancient Serbian; not only in declensions and conjugations, but also in pronunciation.” So paradoxically, we must admit that the Mongol-Tatar yoke in Russia became an era of blossoming Russian culture. The Englishman Jerome Horsey, head of the Moscow office of the Russian Company of English Merchants, wrote in the sixteenth century: "Slavic, that is, the Russian language can also be useful in Turkey, Persia, and even in the now known parts of India." It appears that in the sixteenth century, part of the population of Turkey, Persia, and India spoke Russian. It is known that many books and official documents of the imperial administration in Western Europe were written and printed in Russian Church Slavonic as early as the 16th century. It is likely that the language of international communication there at that time was Russian. For example, in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. It was not until the seventeenth century that Latin became the international language in the West. However, historians continue to tell us today that medieval Russia was a wild, backward, impoverished, and ignorant country. Forests and swamps, waist-deep snow, bears on the streets and men in bast shoes and ear flaps, always drunk and rowdy. And if anything good happened in Russia, it was only thanks to Europe, which has been progressive, rich, and civilized since ancient times. But the Russian historian and researcher, the oldest curator of the Hermitage, Ihvan Gieorghievich Spassky, in his monograph "Russian Ye'fimki" says something completely different. He informs us that Western European silver flowed into Russia until the 17th century. Russia was inundated with silver and gold, since it had no gold or

silver mines of its own at the time. Part of the silver imported annually was used in jewelry production, and found its way into the decoration of Russian churches, the royal treasury, and the homes of the wealthy. The sheer abundance of buried coin treasures found on the territory of Russia is incomprehensible. Only during the medieval period in Russia were the golden gates cast in Vladimir and Kyiv. Only in Russia were the domes of churches and roofs covered with gold, not only in the capital but also in provincial cities. The abundance of gold in Russia up until the 17th century, according to Kahramzin, confirms the remarkable prosperity of the Russian princes during the Tatar-Mongol yoke. This map, made in Paris in 1670, is called The Great Tartary. According to the map, the territory of The Great Tartary included not only the Russian Empire, but also Western Europe, India, Iran, China, Japan and America. This map suggests that The Great Tartary was once a huge, powerful, centralized state. In many provinces of the Mongol Empire, local governors were in charge, assigned by the Khan, who ruled from the capital city of the empire in Russia-Horde. All of these governors were vassals of this emperor. In those years, there was only one emperor in the empire. The word "emperor" was exclusively applied to the tsar-khan of the metropolis of Russia-horde and the Great Mongol Empire. The nobility and aristocracy of Western Europe in those days largely consisted of the conquerors, that is, natives of Russia, who arrived in the 13th to 14th centuries. Even in the seventeenth century, it was still well remembered that many lands in Germany not long before had been densely populated by Slavs. The same applied to England, Italy, Spain, Greece, and some other European countries that were part of the Russia-Horde Empire. This is why Europe trembled, frightened by the invasion of the Mongol hordes. Now, we understand who these Mongols were and why today the West and not only the West do not want to remember this. The rulers of the countries that emerged on the territory of the former Great Tartary did all they could to forget the servitude of the earlier period. They fabricated their genealogies, pretending to be descendants of ancient civilizations, and designated medieval Russia as a dense wilderness. From everything that is depicted in this part, one can draw a logical conclusion. There has never been any Mongol-Tatar yoke in Russia. There was a specific period of internal process during the unification of the Russian lands and the strengthening of the Tsar-Khan power in the country. The entire population of Russia was divided into civilians, ruled by princes, and a permanent regular army called the horde, under the command of voivodes (military governors) who could be of Russian, Tatar, Turkish, or other nationalities. At the head of the army-horde was the tsar or khan. He held supreme power in the country. The Testament of Ivan Kalita states, for example. “Not knowing what the Almighty has for me in the horde where I am going to, I leave this last will. I order, in the case of my death, that the city of Moscow should go to my sons.” The meaning of this statement is clear to everyone. Going to the army-horde, Ihan Kalita leaves a will for his children in case of his death in battle. Writing such testaments in Russia was then a common practice. The remnants of the Russian army-horde have survived to this day. These are the legendary Cossack troops. Back in the seventeenth century, they were widespread throughout Russia. Russian warriors-Cossacks, having served their term in the Cossack army, retired for a well-earned rest. For this, many monasteries were created in the Mongol Empire. Monasteries served as centers of learning, culture, and most importantly, they were tax exempt, which shows their special status in the Empire. Now we already know that in Russia, the words "Tatars" and "Cossacks" meant, in essence, the same thing. Therefore, Mamai brought to the Kulikovo field not a multi-tribal Mongol-Tatar horde, but Russian Cossack regiments. The Battle of Kulikovo likely was an internal war. It is known that Russia paid tribute to the Horde: a tenth of their property and a tenth of their population. Today, it is

considered, in particular, evidence of the Mongol-Tatar yoke. However, we are talking here about the tax that existed in Russia at that time for the maintenance of the horded army, as well as the conscription of young people into the army. In those days, recruits were recruited into the army-horde at a young age. The recruited Cossack warriors never come back home. This military conscription was the same tagma, a tribute of blood that the Russians allegedly paid to the Tatars. For refusing to pay tribute, the military administration of the horde punished the population in the offending areas with punitive expeditions. These actions are presented by historians today as supposedly Tatar raids on Russian territories. Naturally, such pacification operations were accompanied by bloody excesses, violence, and executions. Gumilev rightly believed that the theory of the Mongol-Tatar yoke in Russia was created only in the 18th century by German historians, such as Bayer, Miller, and Schlözer, in response to a certain social order under the influence of ideas about the supposedly slave origin of the Russian people. This theory gave rise to a blatant fabrication regarding the bloody confrontation in Russia between the Tatars and Russians, depicting some as conquerors and others as oppressed. This is how Russian history was falsified In fact, medieval Mongolia, or Mogolia, was a multination state spread over vast expanses of Eurasia. No foreign power has ever conquered it. It was originally inhabited by peoples who had always lived on their own land; Russians, Tatars, and others. The very word "Mongolia" most likely comes from the Russian "mnogo, mogu'" meaning "a lot, I can" or, perhaps, as Morozov believed, from the Greek word "megalion" meaning "great." In Russian historical sources, the word "Mongolia" is not used, but "great Russia" is found. Foreigners referred to Great Russia as Mongolia, or "the great one". So, we already know that there was never any Mongol-Tatar yoke in Russia. The misconceptions of modern historians about this are erroneous, and potentially deliberate. As, however, determining the date of Christ's birth, from which current chronology is conducted, as you know.

## In What Century Did Christ Live?

Today, almost everyone, regardless of religion, knows the gospel story about Jesus Christ. The time of his life on earth is not only the era of the birth of a new religion; it is a new starting point in the chronology of mankind. In most countries, it is customary to keep the chronology from the birth of Christ. No one doubts that 2,000 years have passed since this most important event for mankind. But why are people so sure of this? We will talk about the fact that the generally accepted date of the birth of Christ, apparently, is erroneous. This conclusion was reached by the authors of the New Chronology project Anatoly Fomenko and Gleb Nosovsky. To study ancient documents, they used their own mathematical, statistical and astronomical dating methods and found out that the true chronology of human development is much shorter than the generally accepted one. This means that most of the historical events happened much later than we used to think including the birth of Christ. Let's say right away that we will not touch on issues of faith and, of course, we will not discuss the teachings of the church. The purpose of this part is to tell about issues of a historical and chronological nature. We are scientists, and we have always emphasized and keep emphasizing in our books that our research does not concern any issues of a theological nature. We do not touch upon the foundations of the doctrine of either Christianity or any other denomination. This is a

purely scientific question, a matter of calculating dates. The question of calculating dates is a matter of applied mathematics. Our research does not concern and does not affect the feelings of believers of any of the confessions. So, let's try to figure out when Jesus Christ actually lived. Once chronologists decided to divide the history of mankind into two eras: before the birth of Christ and after. Scientists call these periods "before the Common Era" and "the Common Era". Actually the Common Era did begin with the birth of Jesus Christ. Oddly enough, the idea of the date of the Nativity of Christ finally took shape only in the middle of the 16th century during the Gregorian calendar reform. That is, one and a half thousand years after the gospel events. It is surprising that neither then in the 16th century, nor now, for some reason, almost no one doubts the accuracy of the established date. It is generally accepted that for the first time the date of the Nativity of Christ was calculated by the monk Dionysius Exiguus (Denis The Little). It happened, allegedly, in 532 AD. That is, 500 years after the event itself. Moreover, Dionysius first calculated the date of the crucifixion of Christ, and only then, relying on the traditional idea of the age of Christ at the time of execution and his own calculations, Dionysius determined the year of the birth of the Savior. Dionysius made his calculations using the method of calculating the dates of Easter accepted in his time, and in doing so made serious mistakes. If Dionysius knew modern astronomy, then he could not have indicated the year of the birth of Christ at the beginning of the Common Era. Unfortunately, astronomical science became sufficiently developed only in the 17th and 18th centuries. But by this time the erroneous date had already been canonized first by the Roman Catholic and then by the Orthodox Church. Historians do not like to talk about this topic and, as a rule, refer everyone to historical documents. But for some reason they are silent about one interesting feature of ancient documents. In the 15th, 16th, and 17th centuries, dates were written differently than today. In the Middle Ages, two forms of recording the name of the Savior were common. The letter I, the first letter of the name Jesus, and the letter X, the first letter of the name Christ. And when it was necessary to write, for example, the year 300 from the birth of Christ, they wrote I 300, that is, the year 300 from Jesus. And in order to record the third century from the birth of Christ, they wrote the X III, that is, the third century from Christ. A good example is the printer's device of Lodewijk Elzevir, allegedly dated 1595. The date 1524 on the engraving by Albrecht Dürer is also indicative. We see that the first letter is not only separated by a dot from the remaining numbers, but is also quite frankly written as a Latin i with a dot. In other words, like the first letter of the name Jesus. And this is a Russian naval chart made during the reign of Empress Elizabeth Petrovna, that is, in the middle of the 18th century. The map clearly says "Kronstadt, a sea map punctual, described and measured by the decree of Her Imperial Majesty in 740 by Captain Nagaev, composed in 750." The numbers 740 and 750 are written even without the letter i. But 750 is the eighth, not the 18th century. And there are many such examples. Most likely, the Latin letters i began to be interpreted as a thousand, and the letter X as 10 not earlier than the end of the 16th century. And thus, the history of mankind has been made longer for a whole thousand years. But ancient documents contain other more important information. It turns out that in the old texts you can find direct dates of the gospel events. These dates are contained, for example, in the old Russian Palea from the Rumyantsev collection of the Russian State Library. Palea is an old church book that has already gone out of circulation. But until the 17th century, it was used by Russian readers as replacement of the "Old Testament". Palea also told about the events of the New Testament, and sometimes even supplementing the Gospel. Palea is significantly different from the canon of the Old Testament familiar nowadays. It was not just a version of the Bible, but a completely

independent book. But it covered the same events as the modern canonical Bible. In Palea, all three dates are spelled out: the birth, Baptism and the crucifixion of Jesus Christ. These dates are written in two ways. The first is the well-known chronological method according to the Byzantine era from Adam, and the second is the old indiction method that has already gone out of use. It turned out that these dates, written in two different ways, do not agree. Although they should match. Let's see what these ways of writing dates look like. In the chronology from Adam, a year is written as a single number. This is, as it were, one almost endless counter of time. We use the same counter today, only the starting point is different, from the birth of Christ. Now consider the indiction method of writing dates. This method was widely used in old chronicles. In the indiction chronology, the year wasn't written by one number, as it is today, but by three, each of which varied within certain limits. Each of the three numbers had its own name: Indiction, Solar cycle and Lunar cycle. Each of them increased annually by one. But as soon as it reached its own limit, it was reset to one. And then again every year increased by one. Thus, instead of one, in principle, an infinite counter of years, in the indiction method three finite cyclic counters were used. They set the year as a trio of small numbers, each of which could not go beyond the given limits. These were: Indiction, which varied from 1 to 15; Solar cycle, which varied from 1 to 28; Lunar cycle, which varied from one to 19. The limiters 15, 28 and 19 participating in the indiction chronology are coprime. That is, they have no common divisors. Therefore, any combination of them is repeated only after a number of years equal to the product of these numbers. 15 multiplied by 28, multiplied by 19, equals 7980. Thus, the repetition of the indiction date occurs only after 7980 years. In other words, over a period of time of almost 8 thousand years, the indiction method sets the year quite unambiguously. Let's go back to Palea. Regarding the Nativity of Christ, it says: "In the year 5500, be born in the flesh, the eternal king, the Lord our God Jesus Christ, on December 25th." The year 5500 is indicated here; this is the date according to the Byzantine era from Adam. And the same year, written in an indiction method: "Solar cycle was 13, Lunar cycle 10, Indiction 15. On Sunday at the seventh hour of the day." But the year 5500 in the indiction technique should be: "Indiction 10, Solar cycle 12, Lunar cycle 9." We see similar discrepancies with the dates of baptism and crucifixion. After all, for scribes it was not difficult to correct such dates and bring them in line with each other, so how could this have happened? Fomenko and Nosovsky suggested that the chronologist-scribe simply could not correct the old dates recorded in the indiction way, because he no longer understood this archaic chronology system. Scribes and editors began to enter dates for the Byzantine era from Adam in the annals in the 16th-18th centuries. But in the ancient primary sources themselves, which they copied or edited, dates from Adam, as a rule, were absent. Instead, there were archaic indiction dates. Trying to keep the original indiction dates, the scribes could spoil them, not fully understanding the meaning of these dates. For example, they confused Lunar cycle and the Lunar age, which is not at all the same thing, which could give an error for many years. Scientists have found that in addition to random errors, there could have been systematic errors, that is, repetitive and associated with misunderstanding of a particular circumstance. These errors could appear for two main reasons. The first reason: initial misalignment between the points of change of three cycles during the year. For example, for the indiction it is important when, in what month the new year begins. The September start of the year, that is, September 1, is considered to be of Byzantine origin. In the old days, there was also a June or Egyptian beginning of the new year, timed to coincide with the beginning of the harvest. The start of indictions in March and January also could not be ruled out. The second reason: the old way of counting Solar cycles according to the so-called Dominical letters on the

fingers. Tables for indicating Solar cycles and Lunar cycles were depicted in the form of two human hands. One of them, the left one, belonged to Solar cycles and was called the Dominical hand. Solar cycle was recorded on the joints of four fingers from index to little finger. Today, on the Dominical hand, Solar cycles increase from left to right, from the index finger to the little finger. But in ancient times, most likely, they wrote from right to left, as the Arabs still do. It turned out that this was exactly what the later scribes did not take into account, who entered the indiction dates corresponding to dates from Adam. It was this systematic error that was discovered by Fomenko and Nosovsky. Considering that in Palea there are three dates at a time: Nativity, Baptism and crucifixion, there is hope to correct these errors and restore the original old dates. To solve this difficult problem, Fomenko and Nosovsky created a special computer program. Having carried out rather complex calculations that were simply inaccessible to the editors of the 17th-18th centuries, Fomenko and Nosovsky obtained several possible dates for the birth of Christ. Three of them were the most likely. 87 AD, 867 AD and 1152 AD. The remaining calculated dates were either BC or already in the twentieth century. But which of these dates is correct? To determine this, it was necessary to check the dates of baptism and crucifixion. In fact, all three dates must be located with a certain time interval. According to Christian tradition, 30 years have passed between the birth of Christ and his Baptism, and 33 years between his birth and his crucifixion. Fomenko and Nosovsky considered all possible options and determined that there are only two solutions that exactly match the gospel description. Of the two, they chose the solution that is confirmed by other studies. The solution turned out to be as follows: the birth December 1152, for Baptism January 1182 and for the crucifixion March 1185. That is, the time of the Jesus Christ’s life on earth is the 12th century of the Common Era and these dates are found not only in Russian documents. The date of the birth of Christ, unexpected for traditional history, can be found not only in ancient Russian documents, but also in European ones. Let us turn, for example, to a very interesting historical document that describes world history from the creation of the world to 1680. This document is called "Theatrum historicum". It was written in Latin by Wilhelm Stratemann, Bishop of Osnabrück, in the 17th century. In 1720, at the behest of Peter the Great, this book was translated into Russian by Gavriil Buzhinsky, Bishop of Ryazan and Murom. And in May 1749, Theatrum was banned by decree of Empress Elizabeth Petrovna. Almost all of its copies were seized. This book talks about the celebration of Christian jubilees, which were celebrated in the Vatican from the 13th to the 16th century. Today we call this book the Lutheran chronograph because it is written from a strongly pronounced Lutheran point of view and describes the whole world history as a prehistory of the Lutherans. It ends with the year 1680, and there the jubilees are discussed in great detail. And from there you can also extract the dating of the Nativity of Christ. Well, by calculation it can be proved that these anniversaries point to the middle of the 12th century. Anniversary is the celebration of the Nativity of Christ, although not annually, but after a certain number of years. In what years these anniversaries were to be celebrated were established by the popes. The first who determined these dates was Pope Urban VI. In 1389, he established celebration of anniversaries every 30 years. And the first such celebration took place a year later in 1390. However, Pope Boniface IX ordered that anniversaries be celebrated not every 30 years, but every 10. This rule was observed in the Vatican until 1450. But since 1450, at the behest of Pope Nicholas V, anniversaries began to be celebrated every 50 years. All this, at first glance, boring information, actually contains unique information. By simple mathematical calculations, it can be determined which dates could be the year of the birth of Christ, according to medieval popes. If in 1390 the anniversary was celebrated as a 30th

anniversary, that is, a multiple of 30 years, and in 1450 as a 50th anniversary, that is, a multiple of 50 years, then the following dates are obtained: 1300, 1150, 1000, 850, and so on with an interval 150 years into the past. It is striking that the resulting list does not contain the very first year of the Common Era, where historians place the Nativity of Christ. It turns out that, unlike the chroniclers of the 16th and 17th centuries, the Roman popes of the 14th century for some reason did not believe that Christ was born in the first century AD. But the most interesting thing is that among the obtained dates there is year 1150. And this is a date that almost completely coincides with the date from Russian Palea. Of course, in order to recognize the 12th century as the time of the birth of Christ, just two old documents are not enough, but there are other confirmations of this date. For example, astronomy. Two striking astronomical phenomena are associated with the period of the Jesus Christ's life on earth. One of them is a total solar eclipse on the day of Christ's death. We will talk about this in the next part. Another phenomenon is a new star, nova explosion in the year of the birth of the Savior. In the Gospel, this event is described as the appearance of the Star of Bethlehem. "Now when Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judaea in the days of Herod the king, behold, there came wise men from the east to Jerusalem, Saying, Where is he that is born King of the Jews? For we have seen his star in the east, and are come to worship him." A nova explosion is an explosion in space, as a result of which star remnants scatter in different directions, sometimes forming clusters and nebulae. One of these explosions left behind a nebula in the constellation of Taurus, which is called the Crab Nebula. For a long time it was believed that the explosion of a star in the constellation Taurus occurred in 1054. This date was indicated in ancient chronicles. Interest in the Crab Nebula arose at the end of the 19th century. In 1899, its first photograph was taken. In the twentieth century, scientists Lampland, Duncan, Baade, Trimble, Bykov, Murray, Nugent seriously studied the nebula. And it turned out that the date indicated in the annals, 1054, is incorrect. Because astronomers were able to establish the exact time of formation of the Crab Nebula. How was it done? In photographs of the emission spectrum of atomic hydrogen, this nebula resembles a crab. Although in the visible spectrum it is just nebulous matter, like a cloud. But in this cloud there are very bright hydrogen emission lines. They are crimson in color and astronomers have measured the expansion rate of this nebula in its individual sections. These data can be used to calculate the age of this nebula or the date of the explosion. During the explosion, the remnants of the star scatter in a radial direction. During the first few thousand years, the speed of expansion of the remnants of the star can be considered uniform, since space is vacuum that offers almost no resistance. This is confirmed by photographs of the Crab Nebula taken in different times. For example, the very first photograph of 1899, a photograph of 1973 and a photograph taken in 2000. One can speak only of the gradual deceleration of the flying fragments, but not of their acceleration. Modern instruments allow quickly and accurately calculating the date of the explosion. The speed of fragments and the distance over which they managed to fly off are measured. Then the distance is divided by the speed and the time of expansion is obtained. The resulting number of years is counted back. And here it is, the date of the explosion. The results obtained by different scientists are on the same time interval from 1110 to 1170. This means that the ancient chroniclers were wrong and a supernova explosion, which resulted in the formation of the Crab Nebula, occurred in the 12th century AD. At the same time interval is the date of the Nativity of Christ, discovered by Fomenko and Nosovsky in the Russian Palea and Theatrum 1150-1152. So, most likely, this was the same Star of Bethlehem. The fact that the star flared up in the middle of the 12th century is indicated by another astronomical fact. The Gospel says that the star was not just burning, but moving, leading the Magi to the

birthplace of Jesus. “The star, which they saw in the east, went before them, till it came and stood over where the young child was”. But this description resembles the movement of a comet. In general, the appearance of a comet is rather unusual phenomenon. As a rule, comets appear in the morning or evening hours. Their gigantic tails stretch halfway across the sky. Such a phenomenon cannot go unnoticed by mankind. If a comet is indeed described in the Gospel of Matthew, then it is not surprising that in many old images of the Nativity of Christ, the Star of Bethlehem is shown with an obvious tail. For example, in Giotto’s painting “The Adoration of the Magi” you can see that the tail of this star is stretched to the left and up. So, most likely, the artist painted exactly a comet, and not just a star, the beam of which points to the baby Christ. Or in the painting “The Birth of Christ” by the medieval painter Albrecht Altdorfer. And here is the image on the altar, created allegedly in the 16th century by Albrecht Dürer. There are obviously two luminaries above the Magi: a star and a kind of luminous elongated ball with an angel inside. Probably, in the year of the birth of Christ, in addition to the explosion of a new star, people also saw the famous Halley’s comet. These astronomical phenomena were so spectacular that they could well merge in the minds of people into a single event. Is it possible to calculate whether Halley’s comet appeared around 1152? The orbital period of the Halley’s comet is 76 years. Therefore, it is possible to calculate with high accuracy all the dates of its appearance over several thousand years. The last time Halley’s comet was observed in 1986. We subtract 11 times 76 from 1986 and get 1150. This means that both the Star of Bethlehem and Halley’s comet really appeared almost simultaneously. From ancient times, other astronomical confirmations of the exact dates of the Nativity and the crucifixion of Christ have come down to us. They were left by ancient and medieval astronomers. They recorded these dates in the form of horoscopes. Today, many mistakenly think that horoscopes are associated exclusively with astrology, astromancy and fortune telling. It’s worth noting that all these predictions are far from science. In astronomy, a horoscope is the arrangement of the planets in the zodiac constellations. There are 12 zodiac constellations. Today their names are well known. These are Aries, Taurus, Gemini and so on. The planets constantly change positions in the sky relative to the fixed stars, which reminds a giant clock-calendar. This Celestial calendar has long been used by people to record the dates of especially important events. Anatoly Fomenko and Gleb Nosovsky deciphered dozens of ancient zodiacs. Among them there are two zodiacs which encrypt the dates associated with Jesus Christ. In 1826, the book “Astrology” by the English physician and astrologer Ebenezer Sibly was published in London. This book contains a drawing depicting the zodiac with a horoscope for the date of the birth of Jesus Christ. This is evidenced by the inscription made in the middle of the drawing, as well as the image of the Nativity of the Savior, placed at the bottom of the page. Anatoly Fomenko and Gleb Nosovsky decided to check what date is written in this zodiac. Does it correspond to the generally accepted date of the Nativity of Christ? With the help of the Horus computer program, they carried out all the necessary calculations and found out that this horoscope has only one correct solution. The date recorded by an unknown astronomer is December 25, 1151. No wonder this Zodiac is still considered heretical. This unique Zodiac, recognized as incorrect by traditional history, is in fact another independent confirmation of the date of the Nativity of Christ, calculated by Fomenko and Nosovsky. It turns out that the correct dating of the date of Christ’s birth can still be found in old books, despite the centuries-old efforts of historians of the Scaligerian school, who destroyed more than one thousand “incorrect” books. In Egypt Fomenko and Nosovsky discovered another date associated with Jesus Christ. The fact is that the authors of the New Chronology have studied the artifacts of Ancient Egypt for many years. They

were particularly interested in the zodiacs that adorn the vaults of many Egyptian tombs and temples. When deciphering the Egyptian zodiacs, it turned out that all the recorded dates belong to the period from the 11th to the 15th century AD. And among them there is one in which the exact date of the crucifixion of Jesus Christ is recorded. We are talking about the famous round Dendera zodiac, or as it is also called the zodiac of Osiris. This is a huge image, a bas-relief in stone. It depicts the zodiac, shows constellations and location of the planets in it. Its symbolism is well known to us from the texts of the Middle Ages. And we dated this zodiac, elaborating the studies of previous scientists, in particular, Nikolai Morozov, who was the first to raise the question that the date, attributed by modern historians and astronomers to this zodiac, is incorrect. If one dates the zodiac regardless of its supposed a priori dating, which we did, then a completely different date is obtained, namely, 1185, the end of the 12th century AD. More precisely, March 20, 1185. It was Wednesday, the first day of the full moon, the beginning of the Jewish Passover, which was celebrated for 7 days. So, Thursday was Easter. And the Gospels say that the Last Supper took place on Easter Thursday. Friday was also Easter. The gospels state that Jesus was crucified on a Friday. Therefore, we can name the exact date of the crucifixion of Jesus Christ. It is March 22, 1185. But there is one contradiction in the Gospels. They say that on the day of the execution of Christ there was a solar eclipse. Both astronomers and historians are well aware that if such a vivid astronomical phenomenon as a solar eclipse is mentioned in the annals, then the date of the described event can be established with high accuracy. But the fact is that on the day of the crucifixion of Christ there could not be a solar eclipse. As we said, it was Easter week. And the Jewish Passover begins with the full moon. There can’t be a solar eclipse on a full moon. In fact, a total solar eclipse occurred a month after the end of Easter, on May 1, 1185. Most likely, the execution of Christ and the eclipse simply merged in the minds of people, and ended up on the pages of the Bible as events that took place simultaneously. But why do the authors of the New Chronology believe that the date encoded in the round Dendera zodiac is directly related to Christ? We, and not only us, have written a lot about the fact that Osiris and Christ is the same person. We are not the first to say this. The association between them is so stunning that it has been noticed for a long time. Therefore, if a certain date is written on the zodiac of Osiris, then it is naturally associated with Christ. Therefore, we use the dating of the zodiac of Osiris in connection with Christ. And just like the Russian Palea, the ancient Egyptian round Dendera zodiac indicates 1185 as the date of the crucifixion of Christ. But not only astronomical calculations and ancient chronicles indicate that Jesus Christ lived precisely in the 12th century AD. There is another confirmation of this. Unfortunately, few material evidence of the gospel events has survived to this day. One of them is the Holy Shroud. This is a four-meter long linen cloth, in which, according to legend, Joseph of Arimathea wrapped the body of Jesus Christ after his crucifixion and death. Since 1578, the Shroud has been kept in a special shrine in the Cathedral of St. John the Baptist in Turin. Therefore, today it is known as the Shroud of Turin. According to the traditional version of history, this relic was first revealed to the people in 1353 in the French town of Lirey. Almost two centuries later it came to Turin, and a hundred years later it was placed in the chapel of the Turin Cathedral. At the same time, a special case was made in the cathedral to store the shroud. In this case, the shrine had lain quietly almost until the end of the 19th century, until it was decided to photograph it for the first time. In 1898, on behalf of the church authorities, the photographer Secondo Pia took the first photographs of the shrine and something incredible was discovered. On the negative, suddenly a clear positive image of a human body appeared, front and back. It became obvious that the Shroud kept a mysterious imprint. If you look

at the fabric in normal lighting, it is barely noticeable, but the negative turned out to have a fairly clear image. Even the smallest details were visible. The results of the study rejected assumption that this image was simply applied to the fabric in some ingenious way. It was clear that the very structure of the tissue had been changed, and the drops of blood were real, and they got on the tissue even before the image had appeared. There was no doubt whose imprint it might be. The Shroud of Turin contained an image of the body of Jesus Christ. Nevertheless, scientists decided to clarify the age of the shrine. In 1988, it was decided to determine the age of the tissue by radiocarbon dating. A small piece 10 mm wide and 70 mm long was cut off from the Holy Shroud; it was divided into three parts, which were sent for research to the best radiocarbon laboratories in the world: Arizona State University in the USA, the University of Oxford in the UK and Swiss Federal Institute of Technology in Zürich. Scientists examined these fragments independently of each other. The result of the study was sensational. In this case, the obtained date caused big shock to the scientific community and general public at the time when it was made public. It turned out that this was by no means the first century AD, as it was assumed a priori, but somewhere just the 12th century AD; plus or minus 50 or 100 years maximum. This dating fits perfectly with our results, with dating the life of Christ in the 12th century AD. Experts tend to believe that the most accurate were the findings of the Oxford Laboratory. British scientists have indicated the shortest dating interval from 1090 to 1265. Moreover, some articles even named the year by which the Shroud of Turin was accurately dated: 1150. Naturally, this option does not suit historians. No one wants to admit that the time of manufacture of this canvas is the 12th century. Many scientists still stubbornly call the Shroud a forgery. They are rather ready to admit that it was not made in the 12th, but in the fourteenth century, and made precisely as a counterfeit to fool the people. After all, according to the official version, it was in the 14th century that it was put on display for the first time. But the Shroud was known long before its demonstration in Lirey. Where was it until the middle of the 14th century? It is believed that until the beginning of the 13th century the Holy Shroud was kept in the church of St. Sophia in Constantinople. It means that it was brought to Europe from the East. However, there is no mention of it in the Eastern Orthodox practice. But in the East there is another very revered shrine: the Savior Not Made by Hands or Edessa. There are orthodox icons dedicated to Edessa and a great feast in Holy Week in its honour as well. Another name of this Savior is Ubrus. In old Russian, the word “ubrus” meant a scarf or a long, wide piece of cloth. In general, the same as the Shroud. Therefore, many researchers have long come to conclusion that the European Shroud and the Russian Savior Not Made by Hands is the same object. But why then is the imprint of the whole body visible on the Shroud of Turin, and on the Ubrus only the Holy Face? In historical documents, one can find the Greek name of the Savior Not Made by Hands, Tetradiplon, which means “folded in four.” Most likely, the Shroud of Turin was kept folded for a long time so that only the Holy Face was visible and it was kept in Russia. That is why this shrine is so respected among us and unknown in the West. Most likely, the shrine was taken out of Russia during the Time of Troubles, when Russia was defeated and plundered by foreign troops. That is, not earlier than the 17th century. But what about display of the shroud in the XIV century in Lirey? No one knows exactly what was shown to the people back then. It is possible that this was just a forgery, because the case for the Shroud was made only in 1678. Most likely, it was in the 17th century that the original Shroud appeared in Turin, and until that time it had not been shown, or even had not been mentioned. It was only later that documents and chronicles were supplemented with reports of the demonstration of the Shroud in the 14th century. Of course, the radiocarbon dating method is still

imperfect. There are cases when the dates obtained by this method were erroneous. However, to date, radiocarbon analysis is considered the most accurate method for determining the age of biological objects. Of course, if during the study, scientists comply with all the necessary requirements and can be fairly objective. And the only dating of the Shroud obtained by radiocarbon analysis is the 12th-14th centuries. After 1988, no one carried out a subsequent analysis of the Shroud. This is a rare case where we are dealing with more than just an answer. That's when they say: "The radiocarbon date of this sample is such and such and that's it, and goodbye." What results of measurement were obtained, how they calibrated, nothing is said. But in this case, we have the initial measured data, that is, they were measured in a few laboratories. And here are these initial, so-called raw radiocarbon dates, which have not yet been calibrated, just measured, they were published, they are known. In this case, the radiocarbon method indeed was able to provide an answer. With a certain accuracy, but a reasonable answer. So, the results of research of Anatoly Fomenko and Gleb Nosovsky indicate that the true era of the Jesus Christ's life on earth is the 12th century AD. This is indicated by ancient documents, and astronomical dates, and the results of radiocarbon analysis of the Holy Shroud. And this means that in the 16th century, historians either made a mistake, or deliberately pushed the date of Christ's birth many years back into the past. As a result, the chronology of human progress has become longer by more than a thousand years. Perhaps that is why the so-called mystery of the Dark Ages of the Middle Ages appeared in history. Until now, scientists have not been able to give a simple logical, let alone scientific, explanation. Why are so few medieval objects of material culture preserved to this day and there are so many antique artifacts? But logically it should be the other way around. The only explanation given by historians sounds unconvincing. They invite us to seriously believe that after centuries of rapid development, the ancient civilizations of Europe and Asia suddenly degraded and fell into decay. All the scientific and cultural achievements of Antiquity were forgotten, and for ten centuries people were in the darkness of ignorance. Once brilliant Latin turns into a crude primitive language, art disappears; coinage is abolished in many lands. And in general, glimpses of intellectual work, especially in the early Middle Ages, are accidental and, one might say, single phenomenon. And allegedly only in the 15th-16th centuries during the Renaissance, people suddenly remembered all the discoveries and achievements of their early ancestors and not only began to use, but also improve them. The new exact date of the birth of Jesus Christ puts everything in its place and it becomes obvious that in history there has not been almost a thousand years of backwardness and ignorance, there has not been a gap in historical epochs. There were no sudden ups and downs in the cultural development of mankind. On the contrary, it developed fairly evenly and consistently. We are well aware that the New Chronology is sometimes perceived as a kind of unnecessarily revolutionary upheaval in our understanding of the past and, moreover, in our self-consciousness today. No need to be afraid of this. There have been such examples in the history of science, and they have always led to a new and more correct view of the world. For example, the story of the discovery of Tycho Brahe and Copernicus. They stated that it is not the Sun that revolves around the Earth, but rather the Earth revolves around the Sun. Remember the controversy that arose at that time, the shock in society after this discovery. But nothing sinister, people realized that this view is more correct and corresponds to our ideas about the Universe. But in general, the life of mankind does not get worse from scientific discoveries. Experience shows that the more discoveries, the better we live. At least not worse. And you can, of course, argue with this, but it's hard to argue with the fact that a scientific discovery cannot be suppressed. And many are trying to suppress the

discovery of Fomenko and Nosovsky. Every year the struggle against the New Chronology becomes more and more stubborn. Recently, a deliberate distortion of the main ideas of the New Chronology has been carried out on a large scale. Outwardly solid academic publications present the ideas of Fomenko and Nosovsky in a deliberately caricatured form. The fact is that history is a complex subject. And this type of revolution that we know, such examples of striking revolutionary upheavals, as we have already said, in astronomy, physics, and mathematics have already occurred before. Here in history, this event came later. There is a lot of material here, it was necessary to comprehend a lot, to process a lot. But in our opinion, this will only lead to a more correct understanding of our history. This is very important, including for us, for a better understanding of modernity. In fact, misrepresentation of history is far from being harmless. From time to time, it affects both political decisions and many decisions in our lives. Because people, including politicians, including the leadership of different countries, they sincerely believe in this false picture. Well, in some cases, respective decisions are made, based, among other things, on this picture. And a decision made on a false basis is a false decision, and it can lead, and has led to the most difficult consequences. If 400 years ago the chroniclers made a mistake in determining the date of such an important event for mankind as the Nativity of Christ, perhaps they incorrectly indicated the place of his life on earth.

## Forgotten Jerusalem

In our previous part, “In What Century Did Christ Live?” we talked about a sensational discovery made by Anatoly Fomenko and Gleb Nosovsky, the authors of the New Chronology project. As a result of many years of deep research, scientists have established that the time of Jesus Christ’s life on earth shouldn’t be considered the first century AD, but the 12th. This discovery entails not only a revision of the entire chronology of human life, but also the entire world history as a whole. Having studied hundreds of old documents, Fomenko and Nosovsky came to the conclusion that it is necessary to re-establish not only the dates of most historical events, but also their location. Traditional history assures us that, in general, all historical facts have long been verified and there is no need to prove their authenticity. But in reality this is not always the case. For example, studying one of the most important documents in the history of mankind, the Bible, Fomenko and Nosovsky discovered that in the Old and New Testaments the name Jerusalem doesn’t portray the modern Jerusalem, but a completely different city. We will talk about this in our part. Once upon a time there was a kingdom called the Kingdom of Judah. The capital of this kingdom was the city of Jerusalem. Modern historians and archaeologists claim that this kingdom was located in southwestern Asia, where the state of Israel is located today. The current capital of Israel is also called Jerusalem. Scholars who study biblical history claim that ancient Jewish Jerusalem and modern Jerusalem is the same city. But why are scientists sure that ancient Judah was located exactly here, on the eastern coast of the Mediterranean Sea, and not somewhere else? Let's look at the facts. The capital of the State of Israel is honored as a sacred place by Christians, Muslims, and Jews. It is believed that it was here that the temple of Solomon was built, Jesus Christ was crucified and the Prophet Muhammad ascended to the heaven. Every year this city is visited by thousands of tourists and pilgrims. True, many are disappointed with what they see because it is very difficult to

find genuine evidence of biblical history in modern Jerusalem. Even tourist guides frankly report that both the churches and the houses of the Old City were built much later than the events described in the Old and New Testaments. Plaques installed on some houses inform that, for example, this house was built in the 14th century, and this one in the fifteenth. And the main Christian shrine of Jerusalem, the Church of the Holy Sepulcher, was built in fact in the 19th century. This is most likely the beginning of the 19th century. This is the era of Napoleon, when for the first time Napoleon's troops entered these places, defeating the Turkish troops, defeating the Mamelukes in Egypt. For the first time, Europeans appeared in Palestine at the site of the village of Al-Quds. The church we see today was built in the 19th century. Then they said that, allegedly, there was a church earlier here but it had been destroyed. But what is here today, the Church of the Holy Sepulcher, this is a building of the 19th century. In modern Jerusalem it is impossible to find Mount Calvary or Golgotha. Today, Calvary is just a place where the Church of the Holy Sepulcher stands. There is no a mountain here that would correspond to the gospel description of the place of the crucifixion of Christ. Anyone who carefully examines the so-called ancient part of Jerusalem will be convinced that there is nothing biblical here, except for the names. And even they returned here only in the 19th century with the arrival of European archaeologists. And this is not surprising. Few people know, but 200 years ago there was no Jerusalem at this very place. Here was a small Palestinian village of Al-Quds. So why are historians convinced that the ancient Kingdom of Judah was located on the site of modern Israel? The main support of historians in the study of biblical antiquities is a science called biblical archeology. Its main purpose is search and study of artifacts related to the events described in the Bible. Compared to other sciences, biblical archeology is a fairly young discipline, only 200 years old. But, nevertheless, archaeologists and historians believe that during this time enough evidence was found that it was precisely here, on the site of modern Israel, the Kingdom of Judah was located in ancient times. But in fact, there is no indisputable evidence of this. The American scientist Edward Robinson was the first to study Palestine. He made two trips to this country in 1838 and 1852. It is generally accepted that already on his first visit, Robinson examined the walls of the ancient city. But it sounds at least strange. The fact is that back in the 19th century it was clearly written in studies on the topography of Jerusalem, and references to these books can also be found in our books, these facts are well known that lines of the walls of Jerusalem are not defined. In the 19th century they did not even know yet where the walls of Jerusalem were. Archaeologist Conrad Schick specialized in this in particular. And Schick was one of the first who tried to find biblical names, biblical ruins, temples and holy places in the area. They did not succeed, and for a very long time a lengthy work was carried out to implant artificial biblical names on paper on the territory of Jerusalem. And another famous archaeologist, George Wright, who has been excavating in Palestine for many years, frankly admitted that most of the finds made here prove absolutely nothing. Today, after 200 years, nothing has changed; archaeologists have not found irrefutable evidence. But many pseudo-finds appeared, or, to put it simply, just fakes. For example, the so-called King Solomon's Tablet of Stone, allegedly miraculously found in a pile of garbage near the Temple Mount. Or an ossuary, a stone box in which, allegedly, the remains of Jesus Christ's brother James were buried. This fake ossuary was on display in Canada at the Royal Ontario Museum. It was seen by 100,000 people, many of whom honored this find as a shrine. And only a few years later it turned out that it was a fake. Now in the High Court of Jerusalem, a case is being heard about some of the finds, which may have been falsified. These include the ossuary of the Apostle James. For five hours I testified in this case in

court. This ossuary does not inspire me with confidence. I think that part of the inscription was applied somewhat later. I have my own criterion for evaluating each find and situation. In this case, you can observe a huge disharmony. Therefore, I think that the inscription is not authentic. And how many more such false biblical artifacts are kept in museums and in private collections? I believe that many finds that have come under suspicion are indeed forgeries. I wrote an article about a group of fraudsters who in the late sixties and early nineties were engaged in forging seals in Jerusalem. I also have a garnet stone, which is exhibited in this museum. The garnet itself is an original find, and the inscription on it is a fake. Probably, some of the archaeological finds made on the territory of modern Israel are really ancient. But if they prove nothing, as archaeologist Wright said, maybe the traces of ancient Jerusalem should be looked for elsewhere? So, for two hundred years, scientists and archaeologists have not been able to find evidence that the Kingdom of Judah was on the Mediterranean coast. But, nevertheless, just like two centuries ago, nowadays historians insist that this ancient kingdom was located here. Why? Maybe old maps and manuscripts point to this, or maybe this area matches the biblical description so well that it is simply impossible to make a mistake. But that's what is said about Judah in the biblical book of Deuteronomy. "For the LORD thy God bringeth thee into a good land, a land of brooks of water, of fountains and depths that spring out of valleys and hills; A land of wheat, and barley, and vines, and fig trees, and pomegranates; a land of oil olive, and honey; A land wherein thou shalt eat bread without scarceness, thou shalt not lack any thing in it; a land whose stones are iron, and out of whose hills thou mayest dig brass." It is quite obvious that this description is very different from what can be seen today. The nature of ancient Judah is not at all like the nature of modern Israel. It is hard to imagine that once on this barren land there were wheat fields and vineyards, and water-abundant rivers flowed. And if all this really was here, then what happened? Why did the blooming land turn into a scorched desert? Of course, some changes could occur due to natural or man-made disasters. But there is no evidence at the disposal of historians that cataclysms occurred in this area, as a result of which serious climatic or geophysical changes occurred. In fact, historians are well aware that in the city, which today is called Jerusalem, there never were streams of water, many springs and lakes. This city is located in the mountains. The nearest water artery is tens of kilometers away. Therefore, there have always been problems with water here. In general, it is strange that people chose such an unsuitable place for building a city. All known ancient cities were built near water, because full-flowing rivers and seas have always been used as natural transportation routes. In addition, it was possible to fish. And, perhaps, only Jerusalem is an exception. It is located far from large sources of fresh water, and 50 kilometers from the sea. Although in many medieval paintings, Jerusalem is located near a wide river or strait. High hills overgrown with greenery, tall branched trees are clearly visible. And such an image of Jerusalem is typical of the Middle Ages. At that time, for some reason, artists did not depict Christ crucified in the desert. They probably just knew what the real Jerusalem looked like. But there are other interesting details in these pictures. For example, the people depicted near the cross are wearing warm coats and fur hats. Is this clothing suitable for the desert climate? Historians say that this is just a fantasy of medieval artists; supposedly at that time it was customary to depict the gospel events in this way. However, the Bible also speaks of the fact that it was quite cold in Jerusalem. Here is a quote from the Ostrog Bible, the first book of Ezdra. "Then all the men of Judah and Benjamin gathered themselves together unto Jerusalem within three days. It was the ninth month, on the twentieth day of the month; and all the people sat in front of the house of God, trembling both because of this matter, and from winter. People

numerous and the time is now snowy, and there is no possibility to stand outside.” We have cited the Ostrog Bible because the words about frosty winter and snow have disappeared without a trace from pages of later editions of the Bible. But maybe there are other written sources that give precise indications of the location of Judea? Since Anatoly Fomenko and Gleb Nosovsky established that the era of Christ’s life on earth is the 12th century AD, the medieval documents are of the greatest interest to us. It turns out that in the Middle Ages, educated people believed that Judea was in the very center of the world. Here is what the historian Leo the Deacon wrote in the tenth century, talking about the journey of the Byzantine emperor Nicephorus II Phocas to Judea. "He went to a happy country, to the center of the earth, also called Palestine, which, as the Holy Scripture says, flows with milk and honey." At that time, people called the center of the Earth the middle of the world that they knew. This is how they depicted it, for example, on geographical maps. And Jerusalem has always been placed in the center of this world, the capital of Judah. This is clearly seen, for example, on the Hanns Rüst map of 1480. Of course, these maps are not yet perfect and look more like nice drawings than maps in the modern sense of the word. But for some reason, cartographers depicted Jerusalem in the center. Of course, in the Middle Ages, most people had a rather vague idea of where exactly the Holy City was located. Before the advent of the printing press, it was not possible to create a large number of monotypic geographical maps and books. It was only with the development of printing in the 15th century that the ideas about the World among different peoples became approximately the same. But even with the development of cartography, for most people, Jerusalem was far away and inaccessible. So maybe, calling Jerusalem the center of the world, people put into this concept not a geographical meaning, but a religious one? Probably, every Christian country or just a large Christian community wanted to have its own Jerusalem, which later became not only the religious, but also the political center of the state. If for some reason the religious center moved, the name Jerusalem moved with it as well. The authors of the New Chronology Anatoly Fomenko and Gleb Nosovsky, having studied a huge number of medieval geographical maps and one of the most important documents in the history of mankind, the Bible, found that the New Testament under the name Jerusalem doesn’t describe the modern Jerusalem in Israel but a completely different city. This is Yoros Castle, located on the Asian shore of the Bosporus. It is located about 30 kilometers from the old central part of modern Istanbul. Fomenko and Nosovsky discovered that next to this ancient city of Yoros is Mount Golgotha, the same famous mountain described in the Gospel, on which Jesus Christ was crucified. Today this mountain in Turkey is called Mount Yusha or Mount Beykoz. According to the Gospels, not far from Jerusalem was Mount Golgotha, the place of execution of Jesus Christ. When, in the 18th and 19th centuries, historians decided that ancient Jerusalem once stood on the site of the Palestinian village of Al-Quds, they naturally began to look for Mount Golgotha there as well. However, there were no mountains nearby that matched the description. As a result, a small hill, not much different from other hills, began to be passed off as Golgotha. But to the south of the Yoros Castle there is a mountain that really looks very much like Golgotha. This mountain is Yusha, the highest mountain on the upper Bosporus. Its height is 180 meters above sea level. We found an old book by the Turkish historian Celal Esad, which describes ancient Constantinople. In this book, we came across circumstances that struck us, namely, that next to Istanbul, on its outskirts, in the suburbs, in fact, there is Mount Beykoz, on which there is an ancient grave called the grave of Yusha. According to historians, it is considered the tomb of Joshua. In ancient times, Joshua was the leader of the Jewish people, the successor of Moses. His deeds are described in one of the books of the Old Testament,

which is called "The Book of Joshua". However, why Joshua was buried here in Turkey, no one can explain. Neither historians nor Muslim clerics. Moreover, the Turks themselves say that they know at least three more tombs of Joshua: in the city of Nablus, which today is part of the Palestinian autonomy, in Syria and in Gaziantep in southern Turkey. So, it is unlikely that this place can be treated as a real burial place of the biblical Joshua. But then what is it? Anatoly Fomenko and Gleb Nosovsky believe that this is not a grave, even a symbolic one, but the place of the crucifixion of Jesus Christ. Let's see what this place looks like. This is a flat rectangular earthen elevation 17 meters long and about 2 meters wide. It is surrounded by a high cast-iron grate. Additional iron netting prevents numerous pilgrims from touching the holy ground inside the fence. Inside the fence is a piece of land overgrown with thick grass. Several high trees grow. At the opposite ends of the grave are two circular cylindrical stones, which are reminiscent of small millstones. In the center of one of them, a quadrangular opening and a very noticeable fissure can be seen. The whole structure is surrounded by a high stone wall, in which two doors and several windows have been made. The pilgrims enter one of the doors, pass around the grave in a circle and exit outside through a second door. And now let's see how Golgotha is described in the unique literary monument of the 12th century, "The Journey of the Daniel the Traveller." He made these notes during his pilgrimage to holy places. The first Russian pilgrim also visited Golgotha. This is how the monk described the place of the crucifixion of the Savior. “The crucifixion of the Lord is on the east side on a stone. It was high, above the spear. That stone was round, like a small hill, and in the middle of that stone, at the very top, a hole was carved about a cubit deep, and less than a span wide in circumference. Here the cross of the Lord was erected, and there is a cleft in that stone to this day. The crucifixion of the Lord and that holy stone are surrounded by a wall. There are 2 doors.” And now let's look again how the tomb of Joshua looks like. Here is a tall round stone with a hole at the very top. It really looks like a small hill. Here is a pole or spear. And this is the second stone, on which the crack is clearly visible. A wall around the shrine and two doors. The match is just perfect. But why is this monument called a tomb, because this area is too large for a real grave? No need to think that there is a real grave of someone on the top of Beykoz. Yusha, Jesus, Joshua or Hercules. This is a symbolic grave, surrounded by bars, the actual scene of the crucifixion of Jesus Christ. He was not buried there. This is a holy place for Christians, for believers; that they decided to keep. Two stones were placed there. A stone marking the place where the cross was erected, next to it is a pole with a golden disk, a symbol of a spear. The second stone marks the place where they laid the body of Jesus Christ taken down from the cross. And it's all. This is a symbolic grave, not a real burial. But that is not all. According to local residents, at the foot of Mount Yusha there are three more huge graves about seven to eight meters long. Perhaps these are the symbolic graves of the apostles of Jesus Christ, of which there were 12. Of course, most likely the apostles themselves were not buried there, but the main grave, the main sanctuary of Jesus Christ with the crucifixion, could then be encircled and the symbolic graves of his apostles could have been placed around. There is another important argument that Mount Yusha was the place of the crucifixion of Christ. In many ancient paintings, icons and frescoes, the crucifixion is shown either against the background of a large sea strait, or against the backdrop of a wide river. Moreover, the artists did not draw the sea, but the strait or the river, that is, they always showed the opposite shore. There is nothing like it in modern Jerusalem. But there are mountains in the vicinity of Mount Yusha, because it is located just on the Asian shore of the wide Bosporus, and from there the opposite European shore of the strait is perfectly visible. The discovery of Golgotha was the first important discovery made by Anatoly

Fomenko and Gleb Nosovsky in this ancient land. In the future, Mount Beykoz played an important role in the search for Jerusalem. It was from here that the authors of the New Chronology first saw the ruins of ancient Yoros. Traditional history claims that Constantinople, today's Istanbul, was built in the fourth century AD. But, according to the research of Anatoly Fomenko and Gleb Nosovsky, here on the European shore of the Bosporus, this city appeared no earlier than the fourteenth century AD. And if we ignore the chronology imposed on us back in school, then it looks quite logical. Let's see how Istanbul is located. The city stands at the confluence of the Bosporus into the Sea of Marmara. This place is ideal for the passage of ships to the Black Sea and back, their own ships. And so that other people's ships could not do this, guns were needed that could shoot far and ships with a deep draft for sailing on the high seas were needed. But they appeared only in the 14th century. Without them, it was impossible to control the Bosporus. And, consequently, the construction of the city in such a place was simply pointless. It would be much more convenient to build it near those places where the strait narrows. This would give complete control over the strait. There are two such places on the Bosporus. This is where Constantinople is located. Here the width of the strait is 700 meters, and here it is 900. Here, on the Asian shore of the Bosporus, another medieval city of Yoros was built, which appeared here several centuries earlier than Constantinople. We knew nothing about Yoros. Moreover, in our previous works, we believed that initially Jerusalem was in the place where Istanbul, Tsargrad is now located. True, we were confused by one circumstance. The fact is that, in the gospels, when describing the procession of Christ from Jerusalem to Golgotha, that is, as we now understand, to Mount Beykoz, nothing is said about crossing a large water barrier or a large river, which is the Bosporus. This is a serious water barrier. Moreover, after all, walking from Istanbul to Beykoz is a long way. Even if you cross the Bosporus, it is still about 25-30 kilometers. Therefore, we had a certain feeling of dissatisfaction. Although we understood that in general, of course, the old Jerusalem was here, but we did not know the exact place back then. Research continued, and after a while Gleb Nosovsky arrived here. Here on Mount Yusha he saw a curious reproduction of an old engraving. The reproduction depicts Mount Yusha, and some old city is visible on a high hill in the distance. Gleb Nosovsky decided to see what is now on that hill. According to the research of the authors of the New Chronology, this place was well suited for the location of ancient Jerusalem. But what the scientist saw exceeded all expectations. We couldn’t even imagine that the name of Yoros is just like that, openly written. We thought that there could be some ruins; somehow it would be necessary to prove and look for some arguments. And maybe it's not Jerusalem. Maybe we just think. We didn't have confidence. But when, of course, we saw such a transparent name, and then everything fell into place. So, it turns out that evidence of the Christ’s life on earth, which archaeologists have searched in vain in Palestine, is found in Turkey, near Istanbul, and Mount Yusha is the biblical Golgotha. Unlike Constantinople, Yoros has not survived to this day. This is a ruined city; its ruins are located on a high hill at the confluence of the Bosporus and the Black Sea. Historians do not have an unambiguous opinion about the date of construction of the fortress. Someone believes that the fortress existed in the pre-Byzantine period, and someone suggests that Yoros was built in the 12th century to protect Constantinople from Viking raids. The fact that in ancient times this city was called Jerusalem is quite obvious. After all, the very word Yoros or Hieros, as the Greeks called the fortress, is nothing more than an abbreviated name for Jerusalem. Until the 17th century, not only Greeks but also Russians pronounced and wrote Jerusalem with "O", that is, Jerosalem. This word is also written in Latin "Hierosolyma". In Russian, they began to write and pronounce Jerusalem

with “U” only in the 17th century after the church reform of Patriarch Nikon of Moscow. Most likely, it was this city that was the first capital of the Byzantine Empire, which in the Middle Ages was called the Kingdom of Judah, and the city itself was called Hieros in Greek, and Hierosalim in Russian. And about 300 years later, the Byzantine Empire decided to build a new capital. When this move was made, the place of old Jerusalem, that is, the Yoros Castle at the northern end of the Bosporus, was no longer suitable for the capital. Because there were no piers for large ships. By that time there were already quite large ships. At that time, guns had already appeared. This means that more powerful fortifications of the city were needed. The place itself where Yoros is located, is not very spacious, it is quite limited space. But for the end of the 14th century, this place was already uncomfortable. Thus, Constantinople appeared on the opposite bank of the Bosporus. From Yoros, it got not only the functions of the capital, but also the name Jerusalem. Fomenko and Nosovsky believe that the events described in the Gospel took place in Yoros. Somewhere here in 1185 Jesus Christ was crucified. Let's see if we can find real confirmation of this event. If the biblical Jerusalem really was on the banks of the Bosporus, then it is the Bosporus that is described in the Bible as the Jordan River. By the way, until now, the Bosporus is sometimes called a river and not a strait. From the Bible it is known that the Jordan River flowed from north to south, from one sea to another. It divided the space of ancient history into the western and eastern shores. Moreover, from the biblical description it is clear that the western shore differs sharply from the eastern. It is on the western shore that the Promised Land is located, in which milk and honey flow. This description fits well with the Bosporus. It flows from the Black Sea to the Sea of Marmara and separates two climatic zones. Its eastern coast is rocky, hot and dry Asia Minor. Its other coast, the European one, is the Balkans with mountains and forests, and full-flowing rivers. From the farmer and cattle breeder’s point of view, this is truly a paradise land. The Jordan River in modern Israel does not fit the biblical description at all. It originates not in the sea, but in the Golan Heights, and flows into the Dead Sea, which in fact has always been a lake. The modern Jordan River does not divide the country into 2 climatic zones. Israel is on one side, Jordan is on the other. The climate of both these countries is completely different from the description of the Promised Land. Jordan is mentioned dozens of times in the Bible. In many biblical stories it plays a very important, sometimes even key role. From the biblical text it is clear that it was not so easy to cross this river. Moreover, the text mentions special crossings over the Jordan, for which they had to fight with weapons in their hands. For example, we read the text of the first book of Maccabees. “With that they joined battle, and Jonathan stretched forth his hand to smite Bacchides, but he turned back from him. Then Jonathan and they that were with him leapt into Jordan, and swam over unto the other bank: howbeit the other passed not over Jordan unto them. So there were slain of Bacchides' side that day about a thousand men.” It clearly states that Jonathan's men swam across the river, and not crossed it. The warriors of Bacchides did not dare to swim to catch up with their enemy, although he inflicted huge damage on them. They lost a thousand people. It turns out that the ownership of the crossings on the Jordan was a matter of life and death. The one who managed to cross was saved from the enemy. The Bible mentions two such strategic crossings over the Jordan, but it is rather absurd to assume that the biblical texts are talking about a flat stream, which today is called the Jordan River. It is difficult to call it a full-flowing river. It flows over exactly the same landscape for two hundred and fifty kilometers, and its width at its widest point is only 40 meters, and in narrower places it can be easily crossed. The depth of water here will be no more than knee-deep. But the Bosporus perfectly matches the biblical description. Looking at it, you are not surprised that not everyone dares to cross

this strait even in the narrowest place, which is about 700 meters. The Bible also says that ships were used to cross the Jordan. Here, for example, is a quote from the second book of Kings. “And there went over a ferry boat to carry over the king's household, and to do what he thought good. And Shimei the son of Gera fell down before the king, as he was come over Jordan;” And again, looking at the Jordan River separating Israel and Jordan, it is difficult to imagine that ships could sail along this shallow river. But this cannot be said about the Bosporus, which can only be traveled by ship. Also important in the Bible is the story of the miraculous crossing of the Jordan. This is how it is described in the book of Joshua. “That the waters which came down from above stood and rose up upon an heap very far... And the priests that bare the ark of the covenant of the LORD stood firm on dry ground in the midst of Jordan, and all the Israelites passed over on dry ground, until all the people were passed clean over Jordan.” It seems that the author of the biblical text, saying that the water “stood and rose up upon an heap”, thus described ice, that is, a frozen river. But in the entire history of meteorological observations, the temperature in the area of the modern Jordan has never dropped so low that this river could freeze. But the Bosporus froze repeatedly. Byzantine, Arabic and Western European chronicles have preserved a lot of evidence that the Bosporus, the Dardanelles, and most of the Black Sea were frozen. Moreover, these were not light frosts, but severe frosts. The ice was so thick that the sea, as eyewitnesses wrote, took the form of land. Therefore, it is not surprising that the priests stood in the middle of the Jordan as if on dry ground. Further the book of Joshua says. “Then Joshua called the twelve men, whom he had prepared of the children of Israel, out of every tribe a man: And Joshua said unto them, Pass over before the ark of the LORD your God into the midst of Jordan, and take ye up every man of you a stone upon his shoulder, according unto the number of the tribes of the children of Israel: That this may be a sign among you.” What stones are we talking about here? Let's look at the Bosporus again. Two hundred meters from the Asian shore, opposite the city center, there is a small island in the middle of the strait. The so-called Maiden's Tower is located on it. According to legend, there once stood a chapel in honor of the baptism of the Savior, and a cross was erected. Probably, it was from this holy place in the middle of the river that the priests took those twelve stones as a memory of the harsh winter and the frozen Bosporus-Jordan. So, the geographical location and nature of these lands almost completely correspond to the biblical description of Judea and Jerusalem. Are there any ancient monuments here that can serve as material confirmation of the version of Fomenko and Nosovsky? The authors of the New Chronology believe that there are such monuments here. In the heart of the Turkish capital is the majestic Hagia Sophia. Historians claim that it was allegedly built in the sixth century AD under the emperor Justinian. Anatoly Fomenko and Gleb Nosovsky identify this cathedral with the famous Solomon's Temple, built in ancient Jerusalem. Where did the idea to identify the temple of Solomon with the temple of Hagia Sophia come from? The path was quite difficult and logical. It was based on our study of ancient dynasties using the methods of mathematics, statistics. We found that the history of the kings Saul, Solomon and David partially overlapped with the history of Byzantium in the sixth century AD, that is, the era of Justinian. A simple thought arose; is the temple of Sophia the temple of Solomon? Later on, examining the material in more detail, we found a lot of evidence for this. In particular, having studied the history of the Sophia Cathedral, it turned out that the temple of Sophia was built, of course, not in the 6th century AD, but much later, in the 16th century, a thousand years later. The construction of the Temple of Solomon in the 16th century fits well into the chronological version of Fomenko and Nosovsky. The temple was built after moving the capital from the old Jerusalem-Yoros to the new

Jerusalem-Constantinople. Indeed, upon careful examination of this structure, it becomes obvious that it was built in the fourteenth century AD the earliest. To begin with, the cathedral shows no signs of settlement. All buildings, especially such huge ones as St. Sophia Cathedral, eventually sink into the ground. So that the walls of old buildings do not collapse, they must be dug round, and door and window openings should be overlaid and lifted up. The walls of the cathedral are covered with plaster, but in those places where it is absent, it is clearly seen that there are no traces of re-laying. Why didn't the building, allegedly built in the sixth century, sink at least a meter into the ground? Historians say that the ancient builders made a good foundation. For example, Turkish historian Celal Essad wrote that St. Sophia Cathedral was built on a square base, each side of which is 75 meters. Foundations are laid on a network of vaults, which are covered with a layer of homogeneous concrete 25 feet thick. It's almost 8 meters. Indeed, on such a foundation, even such a majestic building as the Hagia Sophia can avoid settlement. Today, the edges of this concrete foundation can be seen in the excavation at the entrance to the cathedral. But could builders of the sixth century really have made such a powerful concrete foundation? And one more interesting fact. In the 16th century, to strengthen the cathedral, brick extensions were made around it. What was their problem? The fact is that the dome, such a huge dome was built for the first time, and therefore it began to put too much pressure on these vaults, and began to crush the building. Because of this, the so-called flying buttresses had to be attached. That is, such brick extends that did not allow the dome to crush the box on which it stands. It is clear that these buttresses should have been attached immediately, well, a few decades later after the start of construction but no more than that. Because if, as they say, this building has stood for a thousand years without buttresses, then it is strong enough to hold such a dome. If it withstood it for 1000 years, and during earthquakes, several earthquakes, it kept it, why in the 16th century, when there were no earthquakes, attach buttresses? The entire old part of Istanbul is literally built up with huge mosques, the size and architecture of which are very reminiscent of St. Sophia Cathedral. But they are all built in the 16th, 17th and 18th centuries. If you believe the traditional history, it turns out that the Byzantine builders, who managed to build such a majestic building already in the sixth century, did not use their unique experience and no longer built a single similar structure. And only a thousand years later, buildings similar to the Hagia Sophia began to appear in Constantinople. At the very least, this is strange, because people immediately try to put into practice all the new achievements in any field of human knowledge. Why wait a thousand years if the experience was successful? Only one question remains, why did the Ottoman Turks, being Muslims, build such a majestic Christian temple? After all, as you know, Hagia Sophia was originally Christian. The answer to this question is given by the New Chronology. According to the studies of Anatoly Fomenko and Gleb Nosovsky, the religious division between Orthodoxy and Islam began only in the 15th century AD, and finally ended only in the seventeenth. Therefore, it is not surprising that in the 16th century a Christian cathedral was built in Constantinople-Jerusalem. But if Hagia Sophia is really the temple of Solomon, then somewhere nearby there must be a building that belonged to this temple. The Bible says that Hiram, the builder of Solomon's temple, built near the temple a molten sea; a grandiose structure filled with water. Is there such a building near the Hagia Sophia? Opposite the cathedral is one of the oldest monuments of Istanbul, the Basilica Cistern. In ancient times, there was little natural fresh water in Constantinople, so an aqueduct had to be built, through which fresh water came from the Belgrad Forest, located 19 kilometers from the city. This water was stored in underground reservoirs in case the city was besieged during the war. The very name

of this building, the Basilica Cistern, means the reservoir of the temple, because the Hagia Sophia is a basilica in its design. A characteristic feature of the molten sea is that this reservoir for water was not dug into the ground, as is usually done, but was installed on some 12 brazen oxen. At first glance, it seems that this is just some kind of metaphor, but let's see how the Cistern is built. The vaults of this structure are supported by 336 columns, which stand in 12 rows. These 12 rows are probably the 12 oxen. Why in the Bible the columns are called oxen, today it is impossible to say unequivocally. For example, in Russian construction terminology, arches that support the vaults of bridges are still called bulls. An interesting story about the Jerusalem Cistern was told by Josephus Flavius in his book Antiquities of the Jews. “When God sent a snow, there was a lion who slipped, and fell into a certain pit: and because the pit’s mouth was narrow, it was evident he would perish, being enclosed with the snow. So when he saw no way to get out and save himself, he roared. When Benaiah heard the wild beast, he went towards him; and coming at the noise he made, he went down into the mouth of the pit, and smote him, as he struggled, with a stake that lay there; and immediately slew him.” From this story it is clear that we are talking about large underground reservoirs. And the story of Flavius is interesting because it describes a snowy winter in Jerusalem. This is further evidence that it was quite cold in Jerusalem in winter. There are other ancient monuments in Istanbul that witnessed the true history of this region. One of them is the Galata Tower. The height of the tower is 61 meters, the diameter is 9 meters, the height above sea level is 140 meters. It can be seen from almost all points of the central part of the city. The tower was built in the 14th century and was called the "Tower of Christ". The Galata Tower received its second name from the name of the area Galata, where it is located. Today Galata is one of the districts of Istanbul. In the Middle Ages it was a suburb of Constantinople. Residents of the central part of the Byzantine capital called the inhabitants of this suburb "Galatians". Historians are well aware of this word. They call the Galatians the people who settled in the territory of modern Turkey, allegedly even before the emergence of the Byzantine Empire. But for some reason, historians do not connect the ancient settlers with the inhabitants of medieval Galata. But perhaps these are the very Galatians to whom the famous "Epistle to the Galatians" of the Saint Paul the Apostle was addressed. And if this is true, then it turns out that in one of his epistles, Paul directly says that Christ was crucified somewhere here in front of the inhabitants of Galata. This is how his words sound in the Russian Synodal Bible. “Oh, foolish Galatians! Who deceived you not to obey the truth, [you], who had Jesus Christ predestined before their eyes, [as if] crucified among you?” In this phrase, the word “predestined” is the Russian translation of the Greek word “proegraphe”. But it also has another translation. For example, Bibles written in Greek and other European languages retained a more precise meaning of the word "proegraphe", "clearly portrayed." Moreover, in the Russian translation to the phrase “crucified among you?” added words [as if]. So the meaning of this phrase of the Apostle Paul was changed. Now he was addressing not to the eyewitnesses of the execution of Jesus, but to people who, as it were, could imagine it. Interestingly, it was here in Galata that the church of St. Paul was built at the beginning of the 13th century. Of course, historians may object: “It is not at all necessary that the Galatians to whom the apostle Paul addressed were residents of the town of Galata. The Galatians lived not only there, but also on the Dardanelles and in the North-Western Black Sea region. This is true, but the Galatians never lived in Palestine. We repeatedly quoted the Bible. As you know, the eternal book has several translations from the Hebrew language. There is a Russian Synodal translation, there is a Latin Bible, there is an Anglican one. Basically, these texts are the same, but there are details in which they differ. Let's go back to the biblical text.

In the book of the prophet Obadiah, which speaks of the migration of the children of Israel from Jerusalem, in verse 20 there is the word "Besepharad". In Russian translation, this word is translated as "in Sepharad." “And the captivity of this host of the children of Israel shall possess that of the Canaanites, even unto Zarephath; and the captivity of Jerusalem, which is in Sepharad, shall possess the cities of the south.” And in the Latin Bible "Vulgate" and some Bibles in English, the word "Besepharad" is translated not "in Sepharad", but "on the Bosporus" (in Bosphoro). Here is the text. It says in black and white "Jerusalem on the Bosporus". The fact that ancient Jerusalem was indeed on the Bosporus explains many of the contradictions in traditional history. For example, it becomes clear why the Crusaders, who went to conquer Jerusalem in Palestine, instead ended up in Byzantium and captured Constantinople. The crusaders, going to liberate the tomb of the Lord, went to Tsargrad, to Constantinople. This was, in general, the main goal of the crusades. Today the explanation is that, allegedly, later they went to Palestine, where they fought for the tomb of the Lord. However, nevertheless, old documents, old engravings show that the goal of the crusaders was precisely Constantinople, Istanbul on the Bosporus. As we understand, this is quite true. The Crusaders knew perfectly well where the Gospel Jerusalem was located, that it was Tsargrad on the Bosporus. Of course, there was no Palestine, no village of Al-Quds in their times. The studies of Fomenko and Nosovsky show how illogical another statement of historians looks that the Crusades began only a thousand years after the crucifixion of Christ. In our previous part, In What Century Did Christ Live? we talked about the fact that Christ was born in 1152 and was crucified in 1185 AD. Consequently, the Crusades took place literally in the wake of recent events. Moreover, in reality there were not four Crusades, as historians say, but 2; in 1189 and 1204. Ancient documents from the era of the crusaders claim that the crusaders, when they went on their campaigns, went to punish and execute the executioners of Christ. From which it follows, in any sound understanding of this text that, according to the crusaders, the crucifixion of Christ took place in their time. They went to execute the still living executioners of the Saint. Of course, historians today interpret these testimonies as some associations, some memories, some analogies. Because, according to modern historians, 1000 years elapsed between the crucifixion of Christ and the era of the crusaders. Of course, in this part we have not told about all the facts discovered by Anatoly Fomenko and Gleb Nosovsky in the study of biblical history. But even these examples show that the history of ancient Jerusalem is greatly distorted, as well as the entire ancient and medieval history of mankind. But today we can say with confidence that the time of Christ’s life on earth, and the location of Jerusalem, and Yoros are ideally connect with each other and with other events in world history, which we will tell about in our next parts. According to biblical texts, Jerusalem was destroyed by the troops of the Babylonian king Nebuchadnezzar, and then rebuilt. But nowhere in the Bible does it say that Jerusalem was built on the same spot. The authors of the New Chronology found out where Jerusalem, described in the biblical book of Nehemiah, was actually built.

## The Moscow Kremlin

The central book of Christianity, the Bible, contains many secrets. One of them is the construction of Jerusalem described in the Old Testament in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah.

These books tell us that Jerusalem was captured by troops of the Babylonian king Nebuchadnezzar and was totally destroyed, but was restored 70 years later. However, the Bible does not tell us whether Jerusalem was rebuilt on the same spot where it stood before being destroyed by the Babylonian army.

Another fact is curious. It is well known that there have been several versions of the Bible. In different versions, there are different descriptions of the rebuilding of Jerusalem. For example, in the canonical synodal translation of the Bible published in the 19th century, the story of the rebuilding of Jerusalem uses the word *repair* for the restoration. They repaired the walls. They repaired the gates.

Yet in older versions of the Bible published in the 16th century, they used the word *create* or *build*. It seems that in an older version of the Bible, the book of Nehemiah directly and exactly describes the construction of a completely new Jerusalem and not the restoration of the former destroyed city. The later editors of the Bible needed this slight change from the word *build* to the word *repair* in order to convey that Jerusalem was rebuilt on the site of the former capital city and not in a new location.

But that leaves us with the question: where exactly was Jerusalem built?

The Moscow Kremlin.

Russian scholars Anatoly Fomenko and Gleb Nosovsky have been working for many years on a reconstruction of the real story based on a new chronology. They have studied hundreds of ancient records and documents. Analyzing the text of the Bible with the help of their own original mathematical and statistical methods, the scholars reached a conclusion which confounded even them.

One of the amazing facts we brought to light in analyzing the Bible is the discovery that, in a well-known book of the Old Testament, the book of Nehemiah, it seems that there is a description of the Moscow Kremlin in the 16th century.

This hypothesis from the very beginning dumbfounded even us. The idea arose from purely chronological reasoning. According to our research, it appears that the biblical description of the construction of Jerusalem actually refers to the 16th century. But at that time in the history of the Middle Ages there was only one case of the construction of a major holy city: the construction of the Moscow Kremlin.

I’d like to point out that, according to our research, the Kremlin was built in the 16th century, not in the 15th century as historians have thought, but actually a century later. What a comparison of the biblical description and the description from the Middle Ages shows is that it actually makes sense to consider if the biblical description is referring to the building of the Kremlin.

At first glance, Fomenko and Nosovsky’s suggestion that the Bible might describe the construction of the Moscow Kremlin sounds paradoxical. Indeed, it is generally considered that the building of

Jerusalem, as described in the book of Nehemiah, occurred long before the birth of Christ, more than two thousand years ago.

What does that have to do with the building of the Kremlin? And why did these scholars conclude that the ancient fortress was built in the 16th century and not the 15th?

History maintains that the white-stone Kremlin of Ivan Kalita replaced the Kremlin built during the reign of Ivan III and that it was constructed in the 15th century. But in the middle of the 16th century, at the very beginning of the reign of Ivan the Terrible, a fire destroyed the Kremlin. Therefore, Ivan the Terrible had to rebuild it.

But the authors of the new chronology absolutely disagree. They are convinced that Ivan the Terrible didn't rebuild the Moscow Kremlin, but rather built it from scratch. This can be inferred from the history of the construction of the fortress walls of Moscow.

It is generally accepted that the first ring of walls, that is, the walls of the Kremlin, were completed in the beginning of the 16th century. The construction of the second ring of fortress walls, called Kitai-Gorod, was completed only by the year 1600.

This fact deserves special attention because, for a city, there is nothing more important than its defensive fortifications, even more so for a capital. According to the generally accepted historical version, it would seem that in the 15th century both the builders of Moscow and the leaders of the government didn't understand to what degree it was necessary to build several rows of fortress walls.

Wars were sweeping the countryside. Moscow had been attacked by the Crimean khans. But Muscovites had to wait a hundred years before they finally built a second fortress wall. And the third wall, Bely Gorod, was only built in the beginning of the 17th century.

It seems that the Russian rulers needed 200 years to strengthen the defenses of their city to the standards of military technology of the time. Yet in Constantinople, for example, they already had the exact same plan of three rings of walls. It is foreign that in Moscow the construction was carried out according to the same rules.

Without such defenses, the Moscow Kremlin would have been easy prey for an enemy. But we know that in the 16th and 17th centuries it was never attacked.

There is one other curious fact. Sigismund von Herberstein, an Austrian diplomat, wrote a book called *Notes on Muscovite Affairs*. Baron Herberstein visited Russia twice, in 1517 and in 1529. In his book he described in great detail his travels in Moscow and even included a detailed plan of the Moscow Kremlin.

However, there doesn't seem to be any similarity between his plan and the appearance of the actual Kremlin. Anyone who has seen the Moscow Kremlin will see that the number of towers, gates, and cathedrals depicted in the plan don't match. The outer appearance also has nothing in common with reality. The only similarity is the depiction of the city at the confluence of two rivers.

But according to the accepted timeline, by the time of Herberstein's travels the construction of the Kremlin was already complete. Why then didn't the Austrian diplomat depict the Kremlin as it was, but instead some other fortress?

Unfortunately, historians don't have a good answer to this question. It is thought that he simply drew a generalized plan.

However, the authors of the new chronology don't see anything strange. Herberstein simply couldn't draw a correct plan of the Moscow Kremlin because, at the time of his travels, it hadn't been built yet. At best, it was still being built, but hadn't yet reached its finished appearance.

It is generally accepted that the Bible was written more than 2,000 years ago. How then could its pages contain a description of the construction of the Moscow Kremlin, which happened in the 16th century?

Some historians suggest that the architect merely took the description of ancient Jerusalem from the book of Nehemiah as a model and built the Moscow fortress according to the biblical description.

But the authors of the new chronology don't find this explanation convincing either. They believe the age of the biblical texts is exaggerated.

As we discovered, the Bible was written and edited up to the 16th and even 17th centuries. We studied the timeline for the creation of the Bible for a long time and came to the conclusion that the modern version of the Bible is a reasonably late version.

The Bible today is a collection of certain books, and many believe that it appeared a long time ago. Some say a thousand years ago, some say more. But in actuality, the contents of the biblical canon are not that ancient.

Until the 16th century, the books of the Old and New Testaments existed separately, and a unified canon did not even exist. There are around 500 Slavo-Russian biblical manuscripts from the 9th to the 13th centuries in Russian archives. There are the Gospels, Psalters, Revelations, and others, but there is not a single Bible in the modern understanding of the word.

Some might be surprised to learn that in the 15th century the New Testament included more books than today. The opposite is true of the Old Testament. Some books that exist today were missing. They appeared later in the canonical collection. In other words, even in the 16th century the Old Testament was not complete.

This point is witnessed in part in the main church book of the time, the Kormchaya Kniga, a book on canonical law whose lists were compiled with precision. The first printed Bible only appeared in Russia in 1581. This was the well-known Ostrog Bible of Ivan Fedorov. In fact, in the foreword to his publication the Russian printer wrote that he experienced more difficulty in the search for incomplete biblical books.

So indeed, regarding the appearance of the first Russian canonical Bible, it is only possible to say with certainty the 16th century. In other Orthodox communities the canonical Bible appeared even later. For example, it appeared in Greece 300 years after the Bible of Ivan Fedorov, in the 19th century.

As for Europe, the Catholic Church recognized the biblical canon only in 1545 at the Council of Trent. This means that the Latin canonical Bible also appeared in the 16th century.

Traditional history does not have an exact logical explanation for the late unification of the disparate biblical texts into a common canon. There also is not a clear explanation for the absence in

the 16th century of the books of Chronicles, Judith, and Maccabees from the Old Testament. There was no book of Ezra and no book of Nehemiah.

It follows that if in the 16th century there was no book of Nehemiah in the Old Testament, then the builders of the Moscow Kremlin could not have used it as a model. On the contrary, if we assume that the book only appeared at the end of the 16th century, then that means that the book was created at the same time as the construction of the Moscow Kremlin and could in fact be an account of those events.

This event is well known in biblical history. There has been a great deal of research and inquiry about it, and it is important to many people today because the idea that the second Jerusalem described in the Bible is actually Moscow in the 16th century is not an insignificant point, but rather a very serious fact. It changes a great deal not only in our perception of the history of Moscow, but of the history of the Bible in general, especially the Old Testament.

We will now follow the travels of the biblical Nehemiah and, using concrete examples, examine how amazingly similar the Moscow Kremlin is to the Jerusalem of the Old Testament. We will use the text of the book of Nehemiah taken not from one Bible but from three, from different years of publication.

In fact, the biblical texts were not simply rewritten and republished, but from publication to publication they were thoroughly edited and changed. Therefore, a comparison of different texts will make our investigation more precise.

The first text is from the Ostrog Bible published in 1581 by the publisher Ivan Fedorov by order of Duke Konstantin Ostrozhsky. The second Bible is a reprinted publication of the Elizabeth Bible, which was published by command of Elizabeth in 1751. Finally, we will examine the most recognizable version for a modern reader, the Russian Bible also known as the Russian Synodal Bible, which appeared in 1876.

According to the book of Nehemiah, along with the construction of the fortress walls of Jerusalem they also built six fortress gates. Their construction is also described in the texts. They built such gates and placed doors in them.

It is known that there were six fortress gates in the Moscow Kremlin when it was built, exactly the same number as in the fortress of Jerusalem described in the Bible. Today some of the gates have been sealed in, but in numerous old drawings and plans of the Moscow Kremlin from the end of the 16th to the 18th centuries there are six gates. It is clearly visible on the first exact map of the Kremlin called the Kremlin Grad.

The Sheep or Spassky Tower. The first gates that come to mind from the Bible are the Sheep Gates, or Herd Gates. These gates refer to the Spassky Gates of the Moscow Kremlin. In several places in the Bible they are called the Jerusalem Gates.

The gates were also called the Jerusalem Gates because they exited onto Jerusalem, another name for the Cathedral of Vasili the Blessed, or Saint Basil’s Cathedral. This is noted on several engravings, one of which is on display in the museum of New Jerusalem in Istra outside of Moscow.

Through these gates on Palm Sunday the patriarch would perform the symbolic procession on a foal to the Moscow Jerusalem, the majestic Pokrovsky Cathedral. This was a ritual journey on a donkey symbolizing the entrance of Jesus Christ into Jerusalem.

These gates were also called the Frolovsky Gates. It is possible that not far from the Spassky Gates there used to be a church of Saint Florus. It is well known that Saints Florus and Laurus are the patron saints of horses and horned cattle. That is why cathedrals in their honor were built near places with many animals.

On old plans of the Kremlin, rows of shopping stalls across from the Spassky Gates and next to the Pokrovsky Cathedral are labeled as shops where hides of various animals are sold. The bank of the Moscow River at this point, across from the Kremlin, is known to this day as Ovchinniki. So the Spassky Gates could easily be called either Sheep Gates or Jerusalem Gates.

The Fish, or Konstantino-Yeleninsky Gates. After the Sheep Gates, the Bible speaks of the Fish Gates. They correspond to the Konstantino-Yeleninskaya Tower. This tower gets its name from the Church of Saints Constantine and Helena, equal in stature to the apostles, built not far away in the Taynitsky Garden of the Kremlin.

Until 1917 this church was an ordinary parish temple. In 1928 the Bolsheviks destroyed the church. Originally the tower contained a passageway into the Kremlin with gates in it. In the 18th century the passageway through the Konstantino-Yeleninskaya Tower was destroyed and the gates were filled in, but they are clearly visible on an old plan of the Kremlin from that time.

There used to be rows of shopping stalls where they sold fish. To this day there is a side street called Fish Alley. Those gates could very well be called the Fish Gates.

The Old, or Nikolsky Gates. The next gates named in the Bible are the Old Gates. They refer to the Nikolsky Gates. Moving along the walls of the Moscow Kremlin from the Spassky Gates along Red Square to the right, we arrive at these gates.

The Nikolaevsky, or Nikolsky, Kremlin Gates take their name from the Nikolsky Greek Monastery. It was located not far from Nikolskaya Street. This street has for a long time been known for its educational institutions, bookshops, and printing houses. Next to the grounds of the monastery is a building which today houses the Historical Archives Institute, but in the 16th century it contained a printing house and the Synodal Print Shop. This is where Ivan Fedorov printed the first Russian book.

The Nikolsky Monastery was also called the Nikola the Elder Monastery. Thus the full name of the Nikolsky Gates matches the biblical name.

The Dirty, or Trinity Gates. Further along we come to gates called the Dirty Gates in the Ostrog Bible and, in the Elizabethan Bible, the Foul Gates. Their description is strikingly similar to the Trinity Gates in the Moscow Kremlin.

The Trinity and Kutafya Towers combine to form the Trinity Bridge, which was built across the Neglinnaya River and connected the Kremlin with the right bank of the river, which was called Zanegrimenye. From the 15th to the 17th centuries the Neglinnaya was muddy and dirty. Its banks

were rather unsightly and always swamped with sewage from the surrounding residences. How could this not be the Dirty Gates?

The Valley, or Borovitsky Gates. Continuing on we come to the Borovitsky Gates. In the Bible they correspond to the Valley Gates, or Lowland Gates. The Borovitsky Tower is located on the southwest slope of Borovitsky Hill.

Originally the tower was a large quadrangle covered with a wooden tented roof. Judging by the field in the archway, in the 16th century the gates would open a path not onto the hill but only to the hem of the Kremlin, the low bank part of the Kremlin area which has long been called the hem.

The barbican located to the side of the tower was built later, at the end of the 17th century. Thus the gates going out onto the hem originally could have been called the Lowland Gates, or Gates of the Valley.

In the Bible they have a unique description: they repaired a thousand cubits of the wall to the Dirty Gates. This is the only instance the Bible gives us on the construction of Jerusalem.

The Bible's author used the unit of measurement called a cubit. This unit was used by many peoples, but there is no standard reference for that length. It represented the distance from the elbow joint to the tip of the extended middle finger.

In order to determine the length of the wall between the Gates of the Valley and the Dirty Gates, we will use the most common unit of length from antiquity, the Syrian cubit. We will then compare that number to the distance between the Trinity and Borovitsky towers of the Kremlin.

If we look up the Syrian cubit in an encyclopedia, we find that it equals 37 centimeters. Multiplying that by the distance between the Dirty Gates and the Gates of the Valley given in the Bible, we find that one thousand cubits is 370 meters.

If we compare that to the distance between the Trinity and Borovitsky gates of the Kremlin, which measures 380 meters, the difference is only 10 meters. This fits remarkably well.

The Gates of the Fountain, or Taynitsky Gates. The last mention of gates in the Bible refers to the construction of the Gates of the Fountain. In the Kremlin they correspond to the gates of the Taynitsky Tower.

These were the only gates on the section of the Kremlin wall that runs along the Moscow River. In this tower there was a passageway with gates and a barbican which connected the tower with a stone bridge. This raised bridge granted access to the barbican.

The Taynitsky Tower was very important for the defense of the Kremlin from the direction of the river. The tower also contained a well and a secret exit to the Moscow River.

It turns out that all six gates of the Moscow Kremlin completely coincide with their biblical names in the exact order in which the biblical gates of Jerusalem are listed. The parallel is simply ideal.

Besides the gates, the book of Nehemiah also tells us that there were towers without gates in the fortress walls of Jerusalem. Next we will compare these towers with those of the Moscow Kremlin.

The towers of Mea and Hananel. According to the book of Nehemiah, between the Sheep and Fish towers of Jerusalem stood the towers of Mea and Hananel. In the Kremlin the Sheep and Fish towers are represented by the Spassky and Konstantino-Yeleninsky towers.

Between these towers there are two other towers: the Nabatnaya Tower and the Tsar's Tower. The Tsar's Tower is in fact built on top of a wall. In contrast to the other towers, this is the only one that does not jut out from the Kremlin walls. According to legend, Ivan the Great would watch people on Red Square from this tower, which is why it is called the Tsar's Tower.

The Stove, or Corner Tower. Let us read further. Between the Old Gates and another pair of gates the Bible tells us of another tower. In the book of Nehemiah it is called the Stove Tower.

Looking at the Kremlin, the Old Gates in our case are the Nikolsky Gates, and the pair of others are the Trinity and Borovitsky towers located in one wall. Between the Nikolsky and Borovitsky gates is the Corner Arsenal Tower.

At first glance there is nothing to connect the names Stove and Corner towers. However, in many old buildings a structure at a corner was not called corner, *uglovoy*, in modern Russian, but *pechnoy*. Therefore it is not out of the question to assume that the biblical author, having heard the name of the tower, simply mixed up the stress, and instead of the word meaning corner it became associated with a stove. As coal is associated with stoves, the tower came to be known as the Stove Tower.

It is interesting to note that in the description of the construction of Jerusalem in the book of Nehemiah they mention only these three towers without gates.

Looking at the Moscow Kremlin, it does not seem strange. Indeed it is thus described: the mightiest fortress tower and two other towers located across from the Pokrovsky Cathedral, towers from which one can see Red Square where all of the main events of Moscow in the Middle Ages happened.

We have walked along the walls of the Moscow Kremlin from the outside. Now let us go inside and continue the journey of the biblical Nehemiah.

The first building mentioned in the Synodal translation of the book of Nehemiah is located not far from the Gates of the Fountain. It is the City of David and the Tsar's Garden.

In the Ostrog Bible, instead of the Tsar's Garden they talk about the Tsar's Squares, which are reached by stairs leading down from the City of David.

The Gates of the Fountain, according to the version of Fomenko and Nosovsky, are the gates in the Taynitsky Tower. The squares are the Cathedral Square, and the City of David is the Tsar's Palace.

Now let us turn to an old description of the Kremlin in the Middle Ages. On that spot stood the Tsar's Palace. The Great Kremlin Palace was built only in the middle of the 19th century.

From the old Tsar's palace there remain only the Terem Palace, the Tsarina's Golden Palace, and the Palace of Facets. The Palace of Facets in antiquity had an exit onto Cathedral Square via the Red Terrace and staircase. This aligns perfectly.

The City of David is the Tsar's Palace. The steps leading onto the square are the Red Staircase leading onto Cathedral Square. Russian rulers went out onto this terrace to show themselves to the

people. From there, they would parade to the Dormition Cathedral for coronations. From the Red Terrace and Tsar's Staircase resounded the czar's proclamations. Therefore, it isn't surprising that this is where the biblical story begins.

Tombs of the Davidoffs. Further on, following in the path of Nehemiah, are the tombs of the Davidoffs. In the Ostrog Bible, they are called the cavern or grave of Davita. What does this cavern have in common with a tomb? Originally, the word cavern meant an enclosed, clandestine place. Therefore, the Ostrog Bible, which refers to the sepulcher as a cavern, is more accurate than the later Synodal translation, which mentions only tombs. Tombs can be either enclosed or open-air.

On our path around the grounds of the Kremlin, we come to the Cathedral of the Archangel. This cathedral, to this day, serves as the burial vault of the Russian czars. A large part of the cathedral is filled with tombs. This isn't surprising, as Archangel Michael is considered not only the patron saint of battle but also the conveyor of souls to the kingdom of the dead.

The Court of the Brave. Further on, Nehemiah comes to the Court of the Brave near the Ribaritsa. First, we need to explain what the Ribaritsa is. In the Ostrog Bible, it says that the Ribaritsa was created by a great deed, which means it was constructed. That means the Bible is referring to some sort of structure. In Russian, the word for fish is *ryba*, so the name Ribaritsa is very similar to that of the Fish Gates in the Kremlin. As we explained, the Fish Gates were located in the Constantine Tower. Across from the Konstantino-Yeleninsky Tower is the Hobra Chord, or Armory. This fits the Court of the Brave and the Ribaritsa.

It's interesting that the author of the Synodal translation, for some reason, replaced the phrase "created by a great deed" with "dugout pond." In this simple way, the tower became a pond.

The Armory on the Corner. Approaching the next point along the journey of Nehemiah, we again find that the Bible was rewritten and added to. Judge for yourself. In the Ostrog Bible, Nehemiah comes to a place opposite an entrance to the strongest corner. In the Synodal translation, it is described differently: opposite an escapement to the arms in the corner. In both descriptions, there is reference to a corner, but in the Synodal translation there is mention of arms, which is not in the Ostrog Bible.

Continuing on from the Ribaritsa, that is, from the Konstantino-Yeleninsky Tower along the Kremlin walls past the Nikolsky Tower, we come to a corner and approach the Great Corner Arsenal Tower of the Kremlin. As we already said, this is the most massive Kremlin tower, sinking under its own weight deep into the ground. It would be fair to call the most massive tower the strongest corner. But what about the arms from the Synodal translation? This is exactly where the Kremlin Armory was once located. Once again, an exact match. But the Armory was only built in 1701 by order of Peter the First. In the 16th century, there wasn't an Armory here, therefore it isn't mentioned in the Ostrog Bible.

Obviously, the biblical author in the 16th century would describe the place as it was at the time. But then why did someone add the word "arms" to the Synodal translation? Perhaps because someone knew what was actually being described.

Home of the Great Priest. Turning from the corner to the left, Nehemiah approaches the home of the great priest. To move in that direction in the Moscow Kremlin, we need to turn left from the Corner

Arsenal Tower. Passing by several unimportant structures, we arrive at the Court of the Patriarch near the Dormition Cathedral. The Bible is absolutely correct to call either the home of the Moscow Patriarch, or perhaps even the Dormition Cathedral itself, the home of the great priests.

The Tall Column. We will now return to the point from which we started our journey around the Moscow Kremlin, to Cathedral Square. The last structure on the path of Nehemiah is a tall column near the Tsar's Palace. The Tsar's Palace and Cathedral Square sit on a hill, but the biblical author arrives even to an incline and even to a corner.

What column is located near the Tsar's Palace in the Kremlin? It is, of course, the bell tower of Ivan the Great. We should note that in the 16th century it looked different than it does today. It looked more like a column, as it was enlarged later in the 17th century. The Bible calls the structure in Jerusalem a column which rises high, and a guidebook of the Moscow Kremlin would call the Ivan the Great Bell Tower a three-tiered, column-shaped structure.

The Equine Gates and the Gates of Gamifkad. The Bible goes on to tell us that from the main square, Nehemiah proceeds to the Equine Gates. Turning from Cathedral Square to the right, we come out straight to the Borovitsky Gates. Today the Armory is located there, but earlier there was a special yard for horses.

This is already the second mention of the Borovitsky Gates in the book of Nehemiah, and once again it matches perfectly. Not only the Borovitsky Gates, but also the Trinity Gates are mentioned twice. At the end of his journey, Nehemiah ends up at the Gates of Gamifkad, or the Doors of Judgment. The Trinity Gates of the Kremlin could also be called, not only the Dirty Gates, but even the Gates of Judgment, because near them, to the left, stood the Judgment Palace. With this biblical description, the Jerusalem Fortress ends.

The Spring of Dragons. What have we missed moving around the Kremlin following the described path of Nehemiah around Jerusalem? We skipped only those buildings which appeared in the Kremlin much later than the 16th century, that is, in the 18th and even 19th centuries.

The names and locations of all the ancient structures listed in the Bible completely matched with similar structures of the Moscow Kremlin. Even the description of the countryside around Jerusalem, as described in the book of Nehemiah, is similar to the landscape around the Kremlin.

Let's look at the Spring of Dragons. This is also a very interesting point. Nehemiah, according to the Bible, goes to Jerusalem passing by the Spring of Dragons. The Spring of Dragons is located, according to the Bible, not far from the Gates of the Valley, and in fact, next to the Borovitsky Gates of the Moscow Kremlin there used to be a Devil's Brook.

If we can equate the ancient words for dragon and devil—and a language specialist wrote that even in the old Russian language, the words devil and dragon were synonyms—then the Devil's Brook is the Spring of Dragons. That the similarities between the Bible descriptions and the Moscow Kremlin of the 16th century even include such minute details is amazing.

Square of Moscow. Here a small Devil's Stream intersected with the road to the Borovitsky Gates of the Kremlin. Some called it a stream; others, a brook. The Chertolsky Gates of the Belgorod, the third ring of fortress walls of Moscow, were located here in 1658. By order of Tsar Alexei Mikhailovich, they were renamed Prichistinsky.

Next to them was a Market Square. The Cherturi flowed along this square and made life unpleasant for the townspeople. After it rained, the brook would overflow and flood the square with water. Therefore, in 1870, they constructed an underground pipeline. Until 1933, the Church of the Intercession on the Dirt stood there. Today it is the above-ground platform of the Kropotkinskaya Metro Station. Near the metro is a side street which to this day is called Chertolsky Alley.

Jerusalem in the Snow. Besides descriptions of the architecture and features of Jerusalem, the Bible also contains a curious description of the climate of the ancient city. We'll turn our attention now to another book of the Old Testament, the first book of Ezra, in which the reconstruction of Jerusalem is also described.

In part, the book describes how the inhabitants of Jerusalem were called to gather in the city's squares. Here we again see that the text of the Bible was constantly being edited and changed.

Here is how the event is described in the Ostrog Bible: all the people of Judea and Benjamin gathered in Jerusalem in the ninth month, on the 20th day of the month. Acknowledge your sins before God. In winter it was the time of snow, and it was too strong to stand in it. It is clearly stated in the Ostrog Bible that there was snow in winter in Jerusalem, when it was so cold that people couldn't stand on the street.

But the description of such a grim winter appears today only in the Ostrog Bible. In later texts, it is clear to see the corrections of an editor. In the Elizabeth Bible, the phrase "time of snow" is changed to "wintertime." Thus, with one word, the traces of the snowy and frosty winter are smoothed over. In the Old Testament, the editors of the Synodal translation went even further and completely erased from the pages of the Bible the reference to snow.

Today, in the modern canonical Bible, the phrase reads: the people were numerous, and the time rainy, and there was no possibility to stand on the street. Gradually, the description of the cold northern climate disappeared from the Bible altogether. In the canonical translation it says that it started to rain, and that scared the soldiers standing there. They started to murmur that they should disperse.

This seems strange, as rain wouldn't be enough to scare soldiers experienced in battle. Moreover, in Palestine, where would such a strong rain come from? It is a hot, dry place, a scorching desert. Of course, the description of the old text of Nehemiah, where it talks of snow and bitter cold, categorically contradicts the climatic conditions of modern Palestine in Israel.

In order to minimize the contradiction, they made those changes.

Thank you, Moscow Jerusalem.

We've compared the Kremlin with the description of Jerusalem from the book of Nehemiah, and we've seen that the version presented by the authors of the new chronology looks very convincing, albeit paradoxical. This new historical variant won't find room on the Procrustean couch of traditional history. But the comprehension of history involves more than just the study of books already written. It is a continuous search for new, still unknown facts about the past, the thorough study of these facts, and possibly also their re-evaluation.

Therefore, the research of Fomenko and Nosovsky allows us to see a different, original picture of historic events. This picture, of course, is still suppositional. We're putting it forth as a hypothesis, but it does conform to the biblical descriptions. I'll say again: it isn't just fiction that appeared out of nowhere. It is our attempt to explain, purely formally, our chronological conclusion based on the biblical descriptions of the destruction and rebuilding of Jerusalem. It refers to the 16th century.

Less, to a modern person—especially to a religious person—it might be difficult to accept this historical version. If the book of Nehemiah, in speaking about Jerusalem, is in fact speaking about the Moscow Kremlin, then why didn't the biblical author say that he was talking about Moscow, about the Russian capital? Why was it necessary to confuse things?

There is no reason to think that someone intentionally masked the text of Nehemiah in order to make it unrecognizable. It was written by people who used their own language, their own symbols, and their own specifics. The book is an original chronicle written in the 16th century. The events are real enough, but it stands to reason that they are described in their own language, with specific names for the towers and for the people involved in the construction.

It is likely that not only in the 16th century, but also later, it was understood by citizens of the Russian capital, as well as foreigners, that the book of Nehemiah was describing the construction of the Kremlin.

It was even clear on the title page of the first printed Moscow Bible, published in 1663 by order of Tsar Alexei Mikhailovich. In the center of the page was a drawing of a plan of Moscow. Above the drawing is written, "Rise up, rise up, Jerusalem." It is amazing that this is written, for some reason, backwards, as a mirror image. Perhaps they were hiding it from the non-initiated. It seems that this is directly naming Moscow as Jerusalem.

Ivan Zabelin, a 19th-century Russian historian, wrote in his book *A History of the City of Moscow* that it was called Jerusalem thanks to the Germans who came to Moscow.

There is no other capital from the Middle Ages that can even compare to the Moscow Kremlin. Of course, such a feat of construction amazed many at the time. The admiration, the delight, the feeling it raised in people were reflected in the Bible. There is nothing surprising in the fact that such a major event found its way into the Bible.

The history of the construction of the Moscow Kremlin isn't the only discovery made by the authors of the new chronology from their examination of the texts of the Bible. Applying their own original methods, they have been working for decades on the creation of an original history of mankind. Having studied and correlated a huge number of documents, they reached the conclusion that we are separated from the events of the Bible not by two, three, or four thousand years, but by much less. Most importantly, the majority of these events occurred in the Middle Ages in Russia, and therefore are part of Russian history.

It fell to Anatoly Fomenko and Gleb Nosovsky to undertake a complete reconstruction of the events of world history, which called for a new, correct timeline.

## Reconstruction of True History

Many of us love to travel. While traveling, we often see palaces and castles, temples and monasteries, ancient and medieval fortresses and ruins of cities. We visit museums. While looking at museum exhibits, we recall the knowledge, often in fragments, learned in history classes. Sometimes we flash back to something that we saw on TV shows or movies, or read in books and newspapers. Here is the sword of Alexander the Great. When did this fearsome ruler live? It seems that he lived in the fourth century BC. He was a strong man. He conquered Greece, Persia, almost all of India. And here are the Etruscans. What did our history teacher say about them? They were some mysterious people, apparently appearing out of nowhere in Italy. And it was also said that no one could decipher their inscriptions. The ancient amphorae were made of very hard diorite stone. Yes, they were skilled craftsmen. And all of this was several thousand years ago. Even now, it's probably difficult to make such things. And back then, it seems, was the Bronze Age. Remarkable. Despite the fact that not everyone remembers even the basic historical events, in our hearts we believe that everything in history is sufficiently determined. And at least the historians themselves know everything and are confident in their knowledge. Museum visitors are unaware that hundreds or even thousands of exhibits are stored in storage rooms that are not put on public display because they contradict established views of history. Can we confidently say that we know history? Each of us is literally packed with historical information. We got this information from textbooks, radio and television shows, from books and newspaper articles. Critically sorting out this information is often almost impossible, since for several centuries it has undergone mutual agreement, forming a monolith of historical knowledge, or rather pseudo-knowledge, and also due to the huge volume of the material itself. It is worth noting that history is studied in our days by epochs and countries. Probably this was done unintentionally, but such an approach does not allow modern man to see the history of mankind as a whole. Instead, he sees a patchwork quilt with holes of ignorance gaping in it. Therefore, we have to resort to the opinion of authorities. But do we trust the right authorities? And are they right about everything? And is there something behind them that prevents us from critically examining our past? It turns out that there are ways to verify the truthfulness of certain historical science claims. This turned out to be within the capabilities not of historians, but of specialists from another field of knowledge, namely mathematicians. In the previous episode of our series “History: Science or Fiction”, we talked about the research of Russian mathematicians in the field of historical chronology. In this part, we will recall the key results of this study, because they fundamentally change our understanding of the past. As a result of many years of work, a group of Russian mathematicians from Moscow State University has created several new mathematical methods for studying historical texts. The effectiveness of these methods was tested on a sufficiently large and reliable material from the Middle Ages and the New History, that is, the 17th to 20th centuries. Then, these methods were applied to chronicles that historians attribute to the era before the 16th century AD. When studying these documents, repetitions were discovered in world history as well as three chronological shifts: approximately 330 years, 1050 years, and 1800 years. As a result of these shifts in history, duplicates of a number of historical personalities and ruling dynasties, and even entire historical eras appeared. We found that different historical chronicles actually describe the same events, but they were erroneously attributed to different historical eras. Through the use of our research, we were able to identify these historical twins. As a result, we have built a new timeline, chronological scale, which is very different from the Scaliger-Petavius chronology generally accepted today. This new timeline, or chronological map, as scholars call it, has taken the traditional historians by surprise. It turned out that the history was not at all what it is

commonly believed. Historians refused to believe it, and the authors of the New Chronology themselves had to undertake the construction of a new, real history. That is, to carry out the reconstruction of history based on the correct dates of the new chronological map. The version of history before the 17th century that exists today is monstrously distorted. These mistakes were made by the chronologists of the 16th and 18th centuries. At the same time, along with unintentional errors, major distortions were made that border on falsification. As a result, we managed to restore the true history before the 17th century. The completion of this activity of creating a fake version of history sometimes lasted even until the 19th century. In some cases, even in the 20th century, major distortions of ancient history have been made. In this part, we will try to present the reconstruction of the main events of world history over the centuries. We will talk about this very briefly, but in sufficient detail so that the history of the world can be taken at a glance. In the next parts we will take a closer look at the most interesting and important moments in world history. And now let's see together what history looks like if we follow the correct chronology proposed by Anatoly Fomenko and Gleb Nosovsky. Let's go through the centuries of history. No information has come down to us in written sources about events earlier than the 11th century AD. Probably, there was no written language at that time yet. It appeared only in the X-XI centuries of the Common era. The epoch before the 11th century must be thought of as Prehistoric era at the dawn of civilization. Probably, at that time people did not yet know how to build any significant structures, and even more so buildings, so they lived in caves or dugouts. Only primitive and crude tools of these people have survived to this day: pottery fragments, bones, stone tools, knives, stone arrowheads and spears, primitive jewelry made of mammoth bones or teeth of predators. Today, all this is exhibited in museums, in halls dedicated to primitive man, who allegedly lived many, many centuries and even millennia BC. But despite the lack of written information, in modern history textbooks there are many details about the life of people in the era before the 10th century AD. Textbooks tell about the legendary Sumerians, about the ancient civilizations of Mesopotamia and America, about the luxurious ancient culture of Egypt from the time of the pharaohs. The Trojan Kingdom and the famous Trojan War allegedly of the 13th century BC are described in great detail. Enlightened ancient China, great ancient Rome, mysterious ancient India, ancient Assyria, Syria and Persia, as well as the most ancient biblical kingdoms of Israel and Judea. And as we are told today, all this existed in the era before the 10th century AD. It is not true. All this really existed, but only after the 10th century AD, that is, in the last millennium of our history. The real written history of the world turned out to be much shorter. The most ancient kingdom was the First Rome or Ancient Rome. The capital of this ancient African kingdom was located near the mouth of the Nile. Subsequently, this city became known as Alexandria. Today we have practically no information about this kingdom. Probably, it was here that writing originated, and initially as a hieroglyphic writing. That is, people at that time wrote down with pictures. We will conditionally call Alexandria the First Rome. There were no cyclopean architectural structures known to us in Egypt at that time yet. There were no pyramids and sphinxes, temples and obelisks. All of them would be erected much later, in the era of the 14th-16th centuries AD. In the 10th-11th centuries, the capital of the kingdom was moved to the Bosporus, where the city of Yoros was founded, located on the outskirts of modern Istanbul. We will conditionally call it the Second Rome. It was also known as the Jerusalem of the Gospels, ancient Troy, medieval Constantinople. Same as the medieval Tsargrad, same as the modern Turkish city of Istanbul. It should be noted the excellent strategic position of this city and its powerful military fortifications, significant remnants of which have survived to this

day. The power of the Second Rome extended to many regions of the Occident and the Orient. Here were located the provinces of Byzantium called themes. Such provinces were Egypt, Ancient Russia, the territory of Western Europe, where Germany, Italy, France, Spain and other states would subsequently emerge. The second Rome, also known as Jerusalem, the holy city, was at that time the universally recognized religious center of the kingdom. All themes were united by a common Christian religion. Independent local history in themes at that time was not generally recorded. Chronicles were kept only in Tsargrad, as in the capital of the Christian kingdom, and mainly reflected events that were of interest only to the capital itself. In the 12th century, important events took place in this New Rome, which were later described in the Gospels. The coming of Jesus Christ, his life on the Earth, crucifixion and resurrection. The crucifixion of Christ took place in 1185, on Mount Beykoz, which is located on the outskirts of modern Istanbul. In the era of Christ, that is, in the XII century, Russia immediately and in full adopted Christianity, and not a thousand years later, as the Scaligerian history assures us. The Russian Tsar Vladimir, that is, the ruler of the world, his mother, Queen Malka, and his chief military commander or Ataman came to worship Christ. In the Gospels they are described as three magi, and are commonly known as Balthazar, Melchior and Caspar. In their honor, a huge Cologne Cathedral was erected, in which the famous Tomb of the Three Magi was placed. Thus, the events described in the Gospels took place not far from Constantinople in the city of Yoros, on the eastern shore of the Bosporus. The city in modern Palestine, today called Jerusalem, was actually manufactured in a rather deserted area of the Middle East from a small Arab settlement of Al-Quds no earlier than the 18th century, or even the 19th, and declared a center of worship. But it has nothing to do with Gospel events. The execution of Christ in 1185 in Yoros provoked a riotous reaction both in the capital itself and in the themes of the Roman Empire. Especially in Russia, which was the birthplace of the virgin Mary. At the end of the 12th – beginning of the 13th centuries, it was Russia that led the crusades, which moved to Tsargrad in order to avenge the execution of Christ and punish the guilty. In 1204, during the crusade, Tsargrad was taken. The city was plundered and burned by the crusaders, that is, the Horde-Cossacks and their allies, a.k.a. the ancient Greek Achaeans, described by Homer in the Iliad. The Achaeans were led by the so-called ancient Achilles, who is also the Russian-Horde Prince Sviatoslav. This event went down in history as the legendary Trojan War, reflected in many documents also under the name of the Tarquinian War (aka Etruscan War) and the Gothic War. In the Scaligerian history of the Middle Ages, this same war is well known under the blanket name of the Crusades of the 13th century, the capture of Constantinople in 1204, then the fall of Constantinople in 1261. In fact, the Trojan War was a series of separate bloody wars. Modern history attaches great importance to the Crusades. In our reconstruction, they play even more important role. The Great Trojan War of the 13th century AD was the first world war of the Middle Ages. It was a war between East and West. It predetermined the course of world history for several centuries to come. With the fall of Tsargrad-Jerusalem at the beginning of the 13th century AD a violent civil unrest comes to the Roman kingdom. This begins the escape, flight and at the same time the invasion of various eastern groups from the metropolitan area of the crumbling Rome. They settled in different countries of Europe and Asia. Members of the royal Roman dynasty also fled from the capital to the provinces of the former empire. Some of them did not want to put up with the loss of supreme power and began fighting for world domination. According to the views of the Roman kings, which had a pronounced religious basis, their royal family had the complete right to own the entire world. And not only the already known lands, but also all those that will be discovered in the future. They considered this

right as a sacred and ancient power belonging to them by inheritance, which, due to temporary reasons, turned out to be illegally taken from them and which had to be returned. As a result, a few states were born that considered themselves successors of Ancient Rome. For example, the Nicene Empire. In ancient times, the modern Turkish city of Iznik was the capital of this empire. One of these states was Vladimir-Suzdal Russia with the capital Rostov the Great. The Vladimir-Suzdal tsars, at that time known as Rostov tsars, were members of the Roman dynasty, expelled from Tsargrad at the time the Rome fell apart at the beginning of the 13th century. They, like other members of the dynasty, began the struggle to restore the empire. But only they, managed to create by both military and peaceful means a powerful multinational state that spanned the Volga and the Northern Black Sea regions. By the end of the 13th century, a strong royal power came into being in Russia, based on the vast natural wealth and resources of the country, as well as on its strong and numerous army, the Horde, the backbone of which was cavalry troops, the Cossacks. Thus, in Vladimir-Suzdal Russia, the metropolis of a new empire emerged, the heir to the former Rome. It was Russia-Horde, or the Great Mongol Empire. There was no Mongol-Tatar yoke in Russia. There was no successful invasion of foreigners into Russia. What is today declared the Mongol-Tatar enslavement of Russia was the unification of Russian principalities and the strengthening of royal power in the country. In 1261, the ruler of Nicaea, allied with the troops of Vladimir-Suzdal Russia, took by assault Tsargrad. The great Mongol invasion of the west began from the east, from Vladimir-Suzdal Russia. This invasion predetermined the outcome of the Trojan War. The final formation of Vladimir-Suzdal Russia took place under the Grand Duke and Grand Khan Georgy Danilovich. Today he is also known to us as Genghis Khan or Gurkhan in foreign sources. The armed forces of the state were called the Horde, which in the old Russian language meant a large military formation, army. The armed forces as a whole were also called the Horde. Due to the fact that the state had unlimited supplies of horses from the herds of the steppe belt, it was able to create a huge cavalry army. Since the horses needed pasture, the army was necessarily nomadic. In order to afford a large army, the rest of the country’s population was subject to tribute, the decima. At the head of the state was the king, who had unlimited power, the autocrat. The capital region of the state was Vladimir-Suzdal Russia. At that time it was called Veliky Novgorod or Novgorod the Great and entered the annals under this famous name. The center of administrative control was the city of Yaroslavl, denominated in the annals as the Yaroslav's Court of Veliky Novgorod. Fortified royal headquarters were located at different times in different cities, in Rostov the Great, in Kostroma, in Vladimir, in Suzdal and in some other cities. Today we call the totality of these ancient Russian cities the Golden Ring of Russia. According to our reconstruction, Tsar Georgy Danilovich of the XIV century, aka Genghis Khan, founded the Great Mongol Empire, and died at a young age. He like other great kings of the Mongol Empire was buried in the Central Ancient Imperial Cemetery of Egypt, known to us today as the cemetery on the Kizekh field. Apparently, a Cossack cemetery, khans and emperors of the Great Empire were buried there. Later, under the pen of historians, he multiplied into several different characters. In particular, he was numbered among the Saints. We know him today as George the Victorious. In addition, he is also the famous Rurik, the prince, mistakenly attributed by historians to the 9th century AD. He is also Mstislav Vladimirovich the Brave, attributed by historians erroneously to the 11th century AD. He is also George Vsevolodovich, erroneously attributed by historians to the 13th century AD. He is also Genghis Khan, erroneously placed by historians in the XIII century AD. In fact, Georgy Danilovich lived and ruled in the 14th century AD, in 1319-1325 AD. By the end of the first half of the 14th century,

during the reign of Ivan Danilovich Kalita, the Russia-Horde began the development and colonization of Eurasia and moved its troops to the west. Russian cavalry troops invaded Europe on a wide front. As a result, much of Western Europe was colonized. The result of the conquests of Grand Duke Georgy Danilovich, and then his brother Ivan Danilovich Kalita, in the first half of the 14th century was the emergence of the Great or Mongol Empire with its center in Vladimir-Suzdal Russia. The Russian kingdom is a Russian term, and the Mongol Empire is a Western European term for the same state. In Russian sources, the World Empire was simply called All Russia or the Russian Kingdom; in foreign it was called Mongolian, that is, the Great Empire. In the 14th century, Ivan Kalita, who ruled the Empire from 1328 to 1340, founded in Italy both Rome and the Vatican as the center of secular and religious power in Western Europe, as well as the Institute of Popes. Ivan Kalita was both king and high priest, caliph. In the West, he left behind a lot of memories, over time, overgrown with legends and myths. For example, about the medieval king-priest Presbyter John. Due to the mistakes of the chroniclers, on the pages of world history he was described several times under different names, including under the name of Batu Khan. Thus, the first half of the 14th century marks the commencement of the conquest of the world by the Russia-Horde. During the 14th-16th centuries AD, the Great Mongol Empire extended its influence over the vast territories of Eurasia and America. Moreover, this was not a military operation, not a conquest, but a more or less peaceful colonization of large spaces. Small tribes, nationalities living in these territories could not seriously resist the Cossack imperial troops. Large new states and kingdoms arose on the colonized lands. For example, the Mughal Empire in India, the Mongol Empire in the territory of modern China, the Mameluk Kingdom in Egypt, the Samurai Kingdom in Japan, that is, apparently, immigrants, native of Samara, from the metropolis of Russia-Horde. And finally, the famous Mayan and Inca kingdoms in America. This conquest was the first wave. It must be said that at that time it was rather not so much about the military conquest of distant lands, inhabited mainly by wild tribes or generally uninhabited, but about their development and assimilation into the Empire. According to some ancient sources, for example, John Malalas or Mavro Orbini, most of the regions of Eurasia and Africa at that time were still sparsely populated. Therefore, the troops of the Russia-Horde, irresistibly spreading in all directions from the Volga, settled on as yet undeveloped lands and founded new cities, settlements, and cultures. For example, the Horde reclamation of India of that era is known to us from ancient sources as the appearance of the famous Aryans there and the foundation of the Aryan-Indian civilization in Hindustan. And the Cossacks who came to Egypt founded the Mamluk dynasty there. Then they were described in the history of the so-called Ancient Egypt under the name of ancient Hyksos. Numerous ancient chronicles tell about this resettlement from the center of the Horde Empire as dispersal of peoples, as The Migration Period, as the great Slavic conquest, as Rise of the Babylon. At the end of the 14th century, the Russia-Horde comes to a turbulent time. In 1380, a bloody battle took place between the troops of Dmitry Donskoy and the troops of the temnik (a military leader) Velyaminov-Mamai. The capital-city and the royal headquarters of Dmitry Donskoy at that time was Kostroma, and the Battle of Kulikovo itself took place on the site of modern Moscow, where the river Yauza flows into the Moskva River. At that time, the city of Moscow was not there yet. This battle was to decide the final acceptance of apostolic Christianity as the official religion of the entire Mongol Empire. Subsequently, Dmitry Donskoy founded the city of Moscow on the site of the Battle of Kulikovo. After about a hundred years of the existence of the Russian-Horde Empire, its rulers faced new, previously unseen problems. As a result of state-building, a network of good roads was built over vast territories.

Epidemics began to spread easily along the well-established caravan routes throughout Eurasia, which from time to time broke out in the south of the Empire. The deadly diseases of plague, cholera and others became the inevitable price to pay for uniting vast territories of Europe, Asia and Africa under one rule. A way out was found by introducing administrative borders on the territory of the vast Empire. The first center is Yaroslavl, aka Veliky Novgorod on the Volga, became the center of the Russia-Horde. The second center, Istanbul on the Bosporus, Constantinople, became the capital of a part of the Empire, the Great Ottoman Empire-Atamania. At the same time, Tsargrad regained its former importance, which it had in the 12th-13th centuries AD. In the interim, the authorities of the Empire decided on forced quarantine cleaning of the areas where the epidemic broke out. According to the central government such areas were the lands of Western and Southern Europe. Ottoman Cossack troops were sent there with a cruel order to murder the sick population of those territories, and to repopulate all those lands. This huge operation is known today as the Ottoman or Ataman conquest, it is also described in the Bible as the conquest of the Promised Land in the books Exodus and Joshua. Such was the situation in the many lands of Western and Southern Europe. The troops of the Horde, the Cossacks, were sent to these areas with strict orders to slay the population of vast territories and repopulate them. This is the famous history of the Ottoman conquest of the 15th century. Thus, in the 15th century, the Russia-Horde was forced to send troops to the South and West for the second time. This was the second wave of conquests, that is, the conquests of previously subjugated territories, on which, starting from the 14th century, there were already armed forces of local rulers, governors of the Horde, who did not want to be slain. However, the quarantine purge was carried out by force and very consistently. New governors were planted on the re-conquered lands of Europe and Asia. In Russian history these events are known as a large-scale allocation of the Novgorod lands to the boyars, the children of the boyars, the nobles, and even the best serfs. As a result, in the middle of the 15th century on the site of the ancient Roman Empire the Ottoman or Ataman empire arose with its center in Istanbul, which was an ally of the Russia-Horde. By the way, the very name of the Atamans, the generic name of the sultans, comes from the well-known name Hetman Ataman, which was the name of the progenitor of the Ataman sultans. At the same time, Western Europe and all of Eurasia are still under the rule of the Great Mongol Empire. Europe, apparently, is somehow divided between the Russia-Horde and Osmania Atamania. Meanwhile, Europe and other territories of Eurasia pay tribute to the central government. Historians call these payments “Tribute to the Sultan.” At that time, each country in Western Europe had its Horde governor-king. The governors were subordinate to the central ruler of the Great Mongol Empire, that is, the emperor. Western Europeans referred to the great Tsar-Khan of the Russia-Horde as "emperor", who ruled in Veliky Novgorod, far from them. There was only one empire, and naturally there was one emperor. In the 15th-16th centuries, a religious split of the previously unified Christianity into several large branches of religions was outlined in the Empire. Namely, Orthodoxy, Islam, Catholicism, Buddhism and Judaism. These names they will acquire only in the 17-18th centuries. Thus, all the main religions known today came from one root, from a united Christianity of the 12th-13th centuries. This explains in particular the conclusions drawn by the large school of 19th-century scholars working in the field of so-called comparative religion. After processing a huge amount of material, they found amazingly much in common between all these religions. But being bound hand and foot by the incorrect Scaligerian chronology, they decided that Christianity absorbed numerous elements of supposedly earlier cults. Actually it is not correct. On the contrary, in the 16th and 17th centuries, previously united Christianity was divided

into several religions, each of which naturally inherited a significant part of the former cult, modifying it. At the same time, they divided previously uniform symbolism. The wide cross was primarily used by the Orthodox Church, the narrow cross by the Catholic Church, the six-pointed star, one of the forms of the cross, by Judaism, and the crescent with a star, also one of the forms of the cross, by Islam. Most likely, the gospels were written at the end of the 12th century AD or early 13th century. The remaining books of the Old Testament were written in a later period. The edition of the Gospel which has come down to us and the one we know today, apparently belongs to the 14th-15th centuries AD, and the books of the Old Testament were finished being written and edited only in the middle of the 17th century AD, that is, very late. In the 16th century, the Empire reached the highest point of its power and prosperity. Moscow took over from Yaroslavl-Veliky Novgorod on the Volga the functions of the capital-city. Instead of a small settlement on the territory of modern Moscow, a grand construction began, on which the best architects from various provinces were brought to work. First, an underground city was built using cut-and-cover method. Then it was covered with ceilings and an elevated city of Moscow was erected. This gigantic construction made a deep impression on contemporaries and was described on the pages of many so-called ancient sources of the 16th-17th centuries. Herodotus describes 16th century Moscow as an Egyptian labyrinth; the Bible calls it the rebuilding of Jerusalem. In the middle of the 16th century, the Kazan kingdom, also known as the famous Khanate of Kazan became the center of the Jewish religion. The Kazan tsar, that is, the Khazar kagan and his court, adopted Judaism. After that, Kazan made an attempt to separate from the Empire. In 1552, Tsar-Khan Ivan the Terrible brutally suppressed the Kazan rebellion. One should not think that medieval Kazan or Khazar Judaism and contemporary Judaism are the same thing. Many modern concepts had a completely different meaning in the Middle Ages. “Jew” meant “glorifying God”, and in the 15-16th centuries Osmania-Atamania with its capital in the Gospel Jerusalem-Istanbul was called Judea. In the era of religious disagreements, any part of the province of the Empire could call itself Israel to emphasize its rectitude in a religious dispute. Above all, the word "Israel", that is, a crusader for God, was a religiously colored name in the Russian Empire of the Middle Ages. In the second half of the 16th century, a revolt of the Horde governors broke out in Western Europe, who no longer wanted to obey the distant Tsar-Khan of Veliky Novgorod and wanted to become independent rulers. As an ideological basis for the uprising, the banner of religious separation from the Empire was chosen. Lutheranism, which emerged in the West, was used by the rebel reformers as a pretext for political separation from the Empire. Having suppressed the rebellion in Kazan, the Russia-Horde turned its gaze to the seething West. It was decided to send punitive troops there. In Russian sources, these events are known as the beginning of the Livonian War. We emphasize that the whole of Western Europe is actually called Lithuania in that context. Historians then covertly portrayed the matter as if it was only a small modern Lithuania in the Baltics. In fact, the Great Empire in the 16th century sought to bring all of Western Europe to obedience. And only later did historians begin to depict things as if the punitive campaign was directed not against all of Western Europe, but only against a small modern Lithuania in the Baltics. Preparations began for a major punitive campaign in Western Europe. But at that moment, turmoil began in the capital of the Empire, which turned into terror and the Oprichnina. According to our research, in Russian history four tsars who ruled one after another in fact went by the same name of Ivan the Terrible. Later, Romanov historians slyly combined them under one name and called them by the shared name Ivan the Terrible. The first tsar is Ivan Vasilyevich. In his reign, Kazan was taken. But later Tsar Ivan IV fell ill, became the Blessed and retired. Today he is known

to us under the name of Saint Basil the Blessed. In his honor, the majestic Pokrovsky Cathedral was built on Moscow's Red Square, which is popularly called Saint Basil's Cathedral. Then the young son of Ivan the Terrible Dmitry became king. On his behalf, the Chosen Council, the board of trustees headed by Adashev, ruled for 10 years. It was at this time the Livonian War began in order to bring Germany, which was engulfed in the rebellion of the Reformation, to obedience. After the tragic death of the teenage tsar Dmitry, his younger brother Ivan ascended the throne. From Ivan's accession to the throne, his relatives on the maternal side, the pro-Western Zakharyins-Romanovs, actually ruled the state. It was they who raised Ivan. As a result, a group of Lutherans, whom the Russian Orthodox Church called Judaizers, came to power for some time. They disrupted the Livonian War, that is, the punitive Russian-Horde campaign to the West that had already begun. In Russian history, the era of the Oprichnina began. The largest massacre of the Horde nobility occurred, including the heirs of the Russian-Horde throne, as well as the sack and destruction of the old Russian capital, Yaroslavl. The famous Oprichnina ended with the defeat of Moscow in 1572. By that time, even the Oprichnina itself was being destroyed. Essentially, it was the defeat of the Zakharyins clan. After this, Simeon Bekbulatovich, the leader of the Zemshchina and a member of the ruling house, came to power. He took the royal name Ivan and tried to continue the Livonian War. But Russia's forces were exhausted by the Time of Troubles and terror. According to the authors of the "New Chronology," later these four tsars were merged into one image, the image of Tsar Ivan Vasilyevich the Terrible. So, at the end of the 16th century, the Oprichnina was defeated and the rule of the old Horde dynasty was restored. This was a new dynastic branch, Semeon-Ivan, then his son Feodor Ivanovich, and then Boris Godunov. However, it was already too late. The Protestants had taken strong positions at the court of the Russia-Horde. Shortly thereafter, a new major Time of Troubles occurred at the beginning of the 17th century. The royal power passed to the Romanovs. As a result of the openly pro-Western policy of the Romanovs and the military-political weakening of Russia itself, the Empire fell apart into several states: Russia, Turkey, Austria, Germany, Poland, Sweden, France, Spain, Egypt, England, China, India, America, Japan, and some other states of Europe and Asia. In Western Europe, former Mongol governors who had split from the metropolis entered into a fierce struggle for land and influence. Heavy wars broke out, now known as the Wars of the Reformation. The fierce division of the inheritance of the Great Empire lasted for many decades. In order to justify their rights to the power they seized and distributed among themselves, the usurpers-rebels in Western Europe and the Romanovs in Russia were forced to rewrite the history of the past. The Great Mongol Empire was erased from the chronicles. Many important events were deliberately pushed into the distant past. The fraudulent Scaligerian chronology was created for this purpose, intentionally aging the dates of many events from the 14th-16th centuries. By creating a false, convenient version of history, the new authorities sought to prove their supposed antiquity and therefore establish their nonexistent hereditary rights to the throne. In the provinces that became independent, based on the former state Church-Slavonic language of the Empire and local dialects, reformers quickly invented and actively introduced new languages. This gave rise, for example, to French, German, Spanish, English, as well as ancient Latin and ancient Greek. This allowed the reformist rebels to erect language barriers between the populations of the newly formed states. The goal was clear: to destroy the former unity of the Empire. But even after the collapse of the Empire, there was still a danger for Western Europe that the crisis in Russia would be overcome. The success of the Reformation rebellion was still not secured and, in general, largely depended on the whim of the Moscow tsar Romanov, even though

he was an ally of Western Europe. Today he is a political appointee and ally, but tomorrow he may change his mind. In addition, there was Turkey, the Ottoman Empire, which was not defeated at all. The center of the rebellion, Western Europe, tried to not allow the revival of the Great Mongol Empire. Probably unable to achieve this by military means, Western European politicians made the main emphasis on diplomatic work. The goal of Europe was to split the former alliance of Russia-Horde and Turkey-Atamah'nia. This task was successfully implemented. The Romanovs initiated a policy of political alienation of Russia from Turkey. It was at this time that the Russo-Turkish wars began. Now Russia and Turkey had no time for Western Europe. They were sorting out their own relationship. For a while, Western Europe got a respite. The penultimate attempt of the Horde to regain power was the so-called uprising of Stepan Razin, which was actually not a rebellion, but a war between two states, fragments of the former empire. Namely, the Moscow states, where the rebellious boyars Romanovs were already in power, and the southern Russian Astrakhan state, where descendants of the old Russian-Horde dynasty remained in power. Stepan Timofeevich Razin was a commander of the Astrakhan Tatar troops. In this war, the Romanovs relied heavily on military support from Western Europe. Their most reliable troops, reiter regiments, were composed of foreign Western European mercenaries. The war ended with the defeat of the Horde troops and the annexation of the territory of the Astrakhan state to Moscow. However, there still remained a huge Russian-Horde state, covering Siberia, the Far East, and a significant part of the North American continent. This state was called Great Tartary. In the 17th and 18th centuries, all centers of resistance of the old Mongolian dynasties were suppressed. For example, the Horde civilizations in the territory of America were drowned in blood by the troops of Western European reformers who invaded them in the 17th and 18th centuries. Later, Western historians shifted all the atrocities of this operation approximately 200 years down in time, to the 15th century. And retroactively attributed them to the period of the Horde-Ottoman colonization of America. Deceptively calling the previous and quite peaceful Horde colonization of the 15th century the bloody Spanish conquest. Thus, they slyly repainted white as black on paper and vice versa, shifting their atrocities onto others. At the end of the 18th century, there was a well-known war between the Romanovs and Pugachev. The events of 1773-1775 were not just the suppression of a peasant-Cossack uprising, as we are explained today. It was a real large-scale war between the Romanovs and the last independent Russo-Horde state, the Great Tartary, with its capital in the Siberian city of Tobolsk. Only by winning the war with Pugachev, did the Romanovs gain access to Siberia for the first time. And it was only after this that the Americans gained access to the western half of the North American continent and began to quickly capture it. But the Romanovs were not idle either. At first, they managed to grab Alaska, but ultimately could not hold onto it. As a result of the victory over Great Tartary, the United States of America emerged from the ruins of the Horde Empire in America. The final division of the Empire took place in the 19th century. This feast of the victors was completely erased from history textbooks. Even in the 18th century, the rule of the Romanovs largely remained an occupation of Russia by foreigners. The serfdom as we know it was introduced by the first Romanovs and was nothing but the enslavement of the native-born populace in the conquered lands of the former metropolis by foreigners. Centuries-old traditions and customs of the Russian people were broken. An attempt was made to carry out a profound church reform, which fortunately did not succeed and led only to a schism, but not to the division of the Russian Orthodox Church. Only many years later, closer to the end of their reign, did the Romanovs change, as if mutated under the influence of many factors of Russian life and turned into Russians in spirit as

rulers. Russia, occupied by Western Europeans in the 17th century, largely assimilated the initial Western European regime of the Romanovs. After the war with Pugachev, having strengthened their throne and being at the head of a huge country, the Romanovs felt like true masters of a large and rich state. They emerged from subordination, lost their reverence for their former Western masters and decided to revive the Russian Empire in the broadest sense of the word. It’s hard for someone who hears about the New Chronology of Fomenko and Nosovsky for the first time. Understanding history is quite challenging, not to mention the vast amount of information that needs to be learned. However, having a correct understanding of the past is so important that it justifies any time spent acquiring new knowledge. Much of what is happening today becomes understandable only after we learn the real history of the world. Of course, we understand that it may be difficult for a newcomer who wants to delve deeper into all of this. Some may even experience shock when introduced to our version, as it differs so much from the history that is widely accepted today. Nevertheless, we are convinced that those who want to make sense, get acquainted with the facts, and carefully look into the logic of the research will soon accept our point of view. A revolution has been brewing in history, similar to the revolutions that have occurred in natural sciences. Humanity cannot afford to keep treading water indefinitely, especially when there are real prerequisites for revising established dogmas. Changes in our understanding of the past are inevitable and necessary. After all, the correct chronology of history affects so much, and it lies unconsciously at the foundation of much knowledge, including climatology and earthquake predictions, understanding the evolution of populations and sociology, linguistics and cultural studies, psychology, and many others. The New Chronology eliminates a large number of mysteries and puzzles, providing simple and natural explanations for them. The chronology and history up to the 18th century AD form the foundation of many political concepts and beliefs of our time. For example, all territorial disputes are actually based on who lived on a particular land first. The roots of these conflicts and disputes go back to chronology. In the event of a change in chronology, territorial claims would also change. Modern religions have a common source, and understanding this should serve to eliminate painful contradictions that have arisen since the Reformation. When the Empire was divided into provinces, various branches of Christianity emerged. Certain differences in Christian beliefs existed even before the Empire's split, but they were not so acute that the unified religion would break up into several faiths so different from each other. Today, humanity could return to these religious origins to eliminate religious strives. The implementation of the existing version of history has led to the estrangement and scattering of peoples who now think of themselves as separate and independent fragments of humanity. After all, it is obvious that correct history influences the formation of a correct worldview. Otherwise, a distorted picture of the world is obtained. But above all, history itself must become a science, and it is already becoming one. How was the false Scaligerian version of history introduced into people's consciousness? How was it possible to do this simultaneously in all countries?

## Falsification of written history

From ancient times, people understood the importance of knowing the history of their nation and preserving it for posterity. It is history that helps a person to realize his belonging to a particular

nation and culture. However, throughout the centuries, history had yet another task. In any state, it stood guard over its political interests and, therefore, was largely subjective. Today, as a result of new scientific research, it has become evident that the entire world history is monstrously and largely consciously and deliberately distorted. Most of us are convinced that falsifying history on a global scale is impossible because such a global falsification is similar to a special operation that cannot be carried out imperceptibly and in concert in all countries at once. And who could do it? A modern person, brought up on the now generally accepted historical version of Scaliger-Petavius, will inevitably ask: How could it happen that the true history was forgotten, and a fictional history took its place in books and textbooks? Is it possible to change the history of all mankind? It turns out that it is, and we will tell you about it. In the previous part, we talked about the fact that there was only one world power in the world, the Russia-Horde Empire. This was in the 13th-16th centuries of the Common era. There was no ancient Italian Rome or ancient Greece, so vividly described in history books, supposedly before the beginning of the Common era. Before the beginning of the Common era, there was no China with its supposedly millennia-old antiquity, nor India or the Sumerian kingdom. There was no ancient Egypt or the states of Maya and Aztecs. All of these supposedly very ancient civilizations did exist, but only emerged in the Middle Ages, starting from the 13th-14th centuries. And the rulers of all European lands were not independent, because they were only sovereign's vicegerents of the Russian Tsar-Emperor. At the turn of the 16th-17th centuries a rift in political power in Moscow and a change in the ruling dynasty took place in Russia. These events, which later became known as the Time of Troubles, were one of the main reasons for separatism in Western Europe. Today, this period of history is known as the Reformation. In textbooks, it is only described as a religious split, schism. But the main aspect is omitted in the description of the Reformation. It was during this time that European rulers, that is, the Horde governors found themselves without a master, without an emperor. Therefore, in the late 16th and early 17th centuries, the rapid separation of the Western provinces from the Empire and the formation of new independent European states began, which required a new history. After the victory of the Reformation, the royal governors, who became the rulers of independent states, many of which had not yet fully formed, had to solve two main problems. The first was to justify their right to power, thus giving it some legal appearance and legitimacy. The second problem was to consolidate their power as supreme, to destroy the memory of the past in order to make it impossible to return to this common past. Their victory was not easy. Many European nations for a long time did not recognize the rule of the reformers and continued to fight for the restoration of the former empire. The formation of new states in Europe mainly occurred in the 17th-18th centuries in bloody battles and wars. To establish themselves as new independent rulers for the former imperial governors was a matter of life and death. But as long as people remembered the Great Empire, the position of the reformers was extremely precarious. The main task that united all the newly proclaimed rulers of Europe, including the Romanovs, the new royal dynasty in Russia, was to destroy this memory, to forever erase the facts of the true past from the pages of history. Not only were the direct participants of those events involved in this global conspiracy, but also their descendants, who still guard the secret of the criminal actions of their ancestors. After the collapse of the empire, the former governors seized power and immediately began rewriting history, presenting it in a favorable light for themselves. Specifically, they needed to appear as independent and hereditary sovereigns in the eyes of their subjects, who were descendants of independent rulers who had once ruled these lands. Otherwise, they could not have created their own states, because

according to the laws of the Empire, they were illegal rebellious rulers. It was a matter of life and death for them to break free from this label. Therefore, when they were composing history, they naturally took the history that existed as a model. This was the history of the Great Russia-Horde Medieval Empire. Therefore, the source for writing history for all of them was the same. They simply changed the clothing, names, and dates, sent various events into the past, created phantoms, but the informational basis for all of this activity was one. This was the history of the Great Russian Medieval Empire. That is why, using our methods, we find that the history of various European states traces back to the same source. The imagination of the reformers was absolutely unrestricted. In order to give significance to their newly emerged countries, and also to their ancestors, they extended their history by hundreds and even thousands of years. Phantom reflections of the dynasty of the Horde rulers-emperors, pushed far back into the distant past, were declared exclusively their own, local ones. They attributed glorious military victories to their ancestors and not only defeats but also all known human vices to their enemies. In this new history, new epochs, kingdoms, and legendary personalities appeared which were actually just phantom reflections of reality, but from a much later period, from the 11th – 17th centuries. These phantoms, duplicates, took the place of the genuine history, the history of the Great Russian Empire, but under different names. Thus, Europe's victory over Russia, over the former metropolis of the Great Mongol Empire, was cemented by creating a new false version of history. With the help of this version, the new rulers managed to form a new self-consciousness among the peoples of Europe, Asia, and America. In one or two generations, memories of genuine history were gone, disappeared from the memory of peoples. And over time, the people believed in their new identity. The invented history often contradicted the authentic character and traditional culture of a particular people. Sometimes these contradictions led to tragic consequences. Italy is a vivid example of this. In the 20th century, admirers of the invented ancient Italian history composed by the reformers attempted to revive the spirit of the Roman Empire in Italy. A beautiful but fabricated myth collided with harsh reality. The same thing happened with Germany, which tried to revive the alleged Thousand-Year Reich. What happened next is well known. With the help of distorted history, the reformers were able to achieve a very important effect for the falsifiers, to create a sense of loss and absence of a national idea in the Russian society of the 17th-18th centuries. Not only the past but also the future was stolen from the Russian people. Deprived of its authentic history, Russia repeatedly found itself in historical and political deadlocks. To maintain their power in a destroyed empire, the principle of "divide and conquer" was used. The unified state, the empire, was fragmented. Hostility and first of all, religious hostility arose between its separate parts, which was fueled by some rulers. It was only after the destruction of the united Russia-Horde empire on the Eurasian territory that the religious wars began. The once united Christianity split into several branches: Orthodoxy, Catholicism, Islam, Buddhism, and Judaism. We will detail the history of the division of churches in one of our upcoming parts. The emergence of at least five independent religions sparked a dispute over which religion was more correct. One argument for the correctness of faith was its antiquity, the older, the better. Thus, another reason arose for writing a new version of history. The authority of each religion largely depended on the international influence of the states that practiced it. Undoubtedly, the stronger the country, the more authoritative its religion, the less it needed artificial elongation of its history. Conversely, if the state was weak in military and political relations, it composed a very ancient history for itself and its religion, replacing the authority of power with the authority of age. In other words, younger religions and states lengthened their history to the maximum extent, while

older ones elongated their history less. To this day, many countries try to use the argument of their supposed antiquity when resolving both religious and territorial disputes. Another way to divide the peoples who lived in a unified empire was to create new languages. In the 15th-16th centuries, throughout the vast Great Russian Medieval Empire, the Church Slavonic language was used as the state language and in Europe as well. After the rebellion of the Reformation, in order to create new independent of each other states, new rulers had to introduce a new language to each of them. There was no large number of languages, and they were created artificially. Thus, French, English, German, and other new languages emerged, because in the Middle Ages, they had other languages, Polish, and so on. Even Ancient Greek and Ancient Latin were also invented by reformers and quite late. And even later, Serbian and Bulgarian languages appeared where at the beginning of the 19th century Russian was still spoken. Building religious and language barriers allowed new rulers to destroy the unity of the peoples of the former empire. Encountering these barriers, the unified cultural space began to break down, and age-old ties between people began to fray. Over time, all the peoples of the dissolved empire came to believe that they had always spoken, prayed, and lived differently, and that they were all very different. Thus, the three main tools of falsification were the division of the unified Christian religion into five main branches, writing new history for entire states and peoples, and creating new languages for communication. The falsification of world history was not random. It can be said that it was largely thought out and coordinated. All of this activity was actually a pan-European state program, which explains the significant coordination of actions of historians from different countries of Western Europe and historians of the Romanov era. This is also indicated by the history of supposedly ancient printed publications. It is noteworthy that from the very beginning these publications were not disjointed and random, which looks rather strange. In the natural course of events, in one place someone would print one book, in another place another publisher independently would print another book, and so on. Only later, over time, people would begin to collect individual printed books and on their basis produce fundamental multi-volume collections. On the contrary, if ancient history is intentionally falsified, then the picture is likely to be reversed. That is, large voluminous fundamental collections of old books and writings would be written and published first. Moreover, they wouldn’t be created chaotically, but in one or several centers; it is more convenient and easier to control the process of falsification that way. Then, based on these so called "approved textbooks", scattered essays would be written, which would be based on the created false set of supposedly primary sources. It is this picture that we see in the 17-18 centuries. As we understand it, in fact, we see a picture of the falsification of ancient history, its primary sources. Thus, the Flemish Order of the Jesuits specialized in forged biographies of saints. From 1643 to 1794, it published 53 volumes. For the 17th and 18th centuries, this was a lot. The monopolistic historical activity of the Flemish order was interrupted by the French Revolution. Another center of production of falsifications was the Benedictine Order, which worked on the writings of the Church Fathers. It is well known that the monks not only copied ancient manuscripts, but also edited them. For example, while preparing an ancient manuscript for printing, the Benedictines compared all ancient biblical quotes with the 17th-century Bible text. And all fragments that differed from the late text were brought into line, or simply put, rewritten. So today we are forced to read not authentic ancient texts, but the result of the work of Benedictine monks. And this is a best case scenario, because the text may even turn out to be a forgery from the 17th-18th centuries. In the mid-19th century, the French abbot Jacques Paul Migne republished the works of the Benedictines. This multi-volume edition was called the Patrology and consisted of 221

volumes of Latin writers and 161 volumes of Greek writers. The sheer number of volumes published by Migne eloquently speaks of the scope of the Benedictine Order's activities in correcting ancient manuscripts. It is therefore not surprising that we encounter the results of forgers' work everywhere. As we can see, several departments were involved in the composition of the Correct History. In the most responsible cases, the leaders of the historical project themselves took charge. For example, it is likely that what is known as "Chronicle" by Eusebius of Caesarea also known as Eusebius Pamphilus was personally written by Joseph Scaliger, the original of which was allegedly lost. However, historians today say that Scaliger began to restore the "Chronicle", but did not complete his work, and in 1787 it was found in an Armenian translation. Suspicion of forgery is reinforced by the very appearance of the Chronicle. Eusebius Pamphilus' chronological tables look exactly the same as the tables published by the Scaliger's school in the 17th and 18th centuries. That is, pages are decorated with multiple vertical columns, each dedicated to the chronology of a particular country or specific flow of events. This Scaliger's forgery is not harmless at all, as he had far-reaching goals, since about three-quarters of the dates that historians still operate to this day are taken from Eusebius' Chronicle. That is, they unfoundedly rely on Scaliger's 17th-century datings without any real justification. As is known, medieval texts were written in a rather clumsy language, and it is not surprising that only over time does the primitive colloquial language become highly literary. Moreover, in the past, when composing a text, only the core words were written, which were made up of consonants. Vowels were either omitted or replaced with small superscript symbols, which is why the well known problem of restoring pronunciation of many ancient texts, including biblical ones, arose. People did not always know how to correctly insert the necessary vowels to restore the text of a document. Why were texts written without vowels in ancient times? The fact is that the material for writing was very expensive, and scribes had to save it. Therefore, they shortened the text by leaving only consonants. Naturally, with a lack of writing material, it was not possible to talk about the formation of a highly artistic literary language. But when people learned to make paper, which became cheaper over time, they had the opportunity to develop a good language. It is not surprising that for many peoples in the Middle Ages, literary language was just being formed. Surprisingly, the earlier purported ancient texts were written in beautiful style. For example, let us open the work of the supposedly ancient historian Titus Livy. Here is how he colorfully and eloquently leads his narrative. “Whether the task I have undertaken of writing a complete history of the Roman people from the very commencement of its existence will reward me for the labour spent on it? I neither know for certain, nor if I did know would I venture to say. For I see that this is an old-established and a common practice. Each fresh writer being invariably persuaded that he will either attain greater certainty in the materials of his narrative, or surpass the rudeness of antiquity in the excellence of his style.” Historians assert that Titus Livy wrote 144 books in the supposedly first century BC in such an elegant style. To develop such a confident and sophisticated style, he must have practiced and therefore written quite a few drafts. However, there was no paper in antiquity. Historians claim that the ancient classics wrote exclusively on parchment. But let's see how accessible it was. To make one sheet of parchment, several complex operations had to be performed. First, skin a young calf or lamb, no older than six weeks. Soak the skin in running water for six days. Scrape off the flesh with a special scraper. Loosen the wool by putrefying the skin in a damp pit with lime ashing for 12 to 20 days. Remove the loosened wool. To remove excess lime from the skin, soak it in oat or wheat bran. To make the skin soft after drying, treat it with vegetable tanning extracts. Even out any roughness by rubbing the skin with pumice,

previously sprinkled with chalk. Because of this laborious process, parchment was considered as precious as gems. And this situation persisted until the invention of rag paper in the 14th century. If we believe historians that the texts of Livy and other alleged ancient authors were written one and a half to two millennia before the advent of paper, then how many calves and lambs were needed to make the parchment on which ancient writers practiced their skills? It is more logical to assume that entire herds of animals were not exterminated for the sake of literary creativity. Most likely, all these ancient books were written in the Middle Ages when paper was already widely available. Quite a few works of ostensible ancient philosophers, historians, and mathematicians have survived to the present day. However, for some reason, all of these works were discovered only in the Renaissance. Historians do not provide a logical explanation for why this happened precisely in the 15th-16th centuries. In addition, there is not a single line of the author's original manuscript of these works in any museum or library in the world. There are only translations or copies, sometimes double or triple, always from a supposedly lost original. Well-known researchers of ancient texts independently have come to the conclusion that some famous texts were written not at the turn of the Common era, but much later. A typical example is the works of Cornelius Tacitus. It is believed that the ancient Roman historian Cornelius Tacitus, author of numerous books including the famous "Histories", lived in the first century AD. The main copies of Tacitus' Histories, known as the First and Second Medicean manuscript, are kept in the public national library in Florence. According to the Scaligerian chronology, these copies are prototypes of all other ancient Tacitus' manuscript copies. The first printed edition of Tacitus' Histories was made in 1470 supposedly from the second Medicean manuscript or from its copy, which was kept in Venice, in the Library of Saint Mark. But the manuscript mysteriously disappeared from there, and perhaps it was never there at all. The history of the discovery of this work is quite vague. It is believed that in 1425, the prominent humanist and writer of the 15th century, Poggio Bracciolini, received an inventory of a number of manuscripts from a monk at the Gersfeld Abbey, which included a manuscript of Tacitus's minor works. Poggio Bracciolini is considered one of the brightest authors of the 15th century, having authored many excellent historical and moralistic books. Bracciolini was a brilliant imitator, and to please the reader, he was able to write like Seneca, Petronius, or Titus Livius, among others. He was like a "literary chameleon" and could imitate anyone. He wrote about theological questions in such a way that, if not for his signature, they would have been taken for the works of the church fathers. Bracciolini was so popular that a monument was erected in his honor in Florence, sculpted by none other than Donatello. It is known that Bracciolini liked to live in grand style and was always in need of money. He chose to earn additional income by producing and editing copies of the works of ancient authors. It's worth noting that in the 15th century, this was a very profitable business. With the help of Florentine publisher Niccolo Niccoli, Bracciolini set up a permanent business of processing ancient literature. He attracted a number of rather educated assistants, although with a very dubious reputation. Bracciolini made his first discoveries in the abandoned and damp tower of the Sankt Gallen Monastery, where he supposedly had the good fortune to find a huge library of ancient manuscripts. There were works by Quintilian, Valerius Flaccus, Asconius Pedianus, Nonius Marcellus, and Probus. After some time, Bracciolini discovered fragments of the works of another ancient author, Calpurnius. However, the circumstances of this discovery are unknown. The manuscripts that Bracciolini passed off as originals, as well as the copies made from them, he sold for huge sums. For example, with the money he earned from selling a copy of Titus Livius's manuscript to Alfonso d'Aragona, he bought a villa in Florence. Bracciolini's clients included the

Medici, Sforza, Este, aristocratic families in England, The Duchy of Burgundy, Cardinal Orsini, Colonna family, and wealthy people such as Bartolomeo di Bardio, as well as universities that were either acquiring libraries or expanding their book collections. In 1425, after receiving a catalog of books from a monk that included works by Tacitus, Bracciolini immediately informed his business partner, the bookseller Niccoli, and offered to buy these ancient books. Niccoli agreed, but the deal somehow dragged on for several years. Throughout this entire time, Bracciolini delayed completing the transaction under various pretexts. When Niccoli grew tired of receiving letters with excuses from him, he demanded that Bracciolini send him the catalog brought by the monk. And then it turned out that Tacitus's "Histories" was not in the catalog. How was Bracciolini going to sell something that didn't exist? At the end of the 19th century, the scholars Hochart and Ross were studying Tacitus' Histories. And they came to the conclusion that this "Histories" does not belong to the first century AD, as is believed, but to the 15th. And they accused Bracciolini himself, who found it, of writing this history. Hochart and Ross studied all the mentions of Tacitus before the 15th century and they found that these mentions were too general and vague and could refer to either Tacitus or some other person. These mentions don't really say anything. Both Hochart and Ross directly asserted that Bracciolini wrote this history in the 15th century. Despite the fact that Hochart and Ross conducted extensive research on Tacitus' Histories and we should be grateful to them for this study, their main conclusion was incorrect. They accused Tacitus of falsification, but they worked within the framework of Scaligerian chronology, which was erroneous. They did not understand what they had actually discovered. According to our reconstruction and our results, it follows that in reality this text is not a forgery, not a falsification. It was written later by Bracciolini, under the pseudonym of Tacitus, and describes genuine events of the 12th-15th centuries.
Throughout history, forgers have created fakes not only the sake of material gain. Some did it to satisfy their own vanity, while others did it even with seemingly good intentions. For example, the prominent figure of the Czech national revival, Vaclav Hanka, very much wanted to prove the antiquity and high level of culture of his native Czech people. To do this, he fabricated the Dvůr Králové and Zelená Hora manuscripts, which contained ancient Czech legends and tales. If the fact of forgery had not been discovered by the Czech linguist Jan Gebauer, then today, perhaps, these manuscripts would have been considered genuine. It should be noted that Hanka's level of forgery was quite high, so today his creation is studied as a monument of Czech literature of the 19th century. Unfortunately, Vaclav Hanka did not stop with the creation of the Dvůr Králové and Zelená Hora manuscripts. From 1823, he served as a librarian at the National Czech Museum in Prague. There was not a single manuscript left in the museum's library that Hanka did not put his hand to. He altered texts, inserted words, glued in sheets, and deleted paragraphs. Hanka invented an entire school of ancient artists, whose names he inserted into genuine antique manuscripts that came into his hands. The exposure of this incredible forgery on such a large scale was accompanied by a deafening scandal. In 1827, Prosper Mérimée released a collection of ballads titled "The Guzla" under the guise of translations from Balkan languages. The book was a great success, and even Alexander Pushkin made a translation of the book into Russian. Pushkin turned out to be more gullible than, for example, Goethe, who immediately sensed the hoax. For the second edition of the songs, Mérimée wrote an ironic preface in which he listed those whom he had managed to fool. "I learned a few words of Slavonic, and wrote in a fortnight a collection of ballads." The collection was secretly printed in Strasbourg and was supplied with notes and a portrait of the author. The secret was carefully kept, and the success was enormous. At the same time, these ballads had the

greatest success not among ordinary readers, but among specialists who did not doubt their authenticity at all. In 1849, the Finnish epic Kalevala was published, which, as it turned out later, was written by a Finnish doctor and professor of the Finnish language of the XIX century, Elias Lönnrot. This literary work corresponded so well to the general mood of that time that it was immediately recognized as a national epic and played an important role in creating a sense of Finnish national identity and in shaping the Finnish nation. The 17th and 18th centuries were rich in finds and the discovery of national epics. This was also the era of the creation of national states in Europe, according to our reconstruction. This fully corresponds to our reconstruction, because national epics were one of the important elements in the formation of the national identity of individual states, the new states of Europe. At the same time, it was announced that certain recently discovered old epics were supposedly written a long time ago. Here are just a few examples. The German heroic epic poem "The Song of the Nibelungs" was supposedly written around the year 1200, but was first printed in 1757. The Spanish epic poem "The Song of My Cid" was supposedly created around the year 1140, but the first edition was published in 1779. The heroic epic of medieval France, "The Song of Roland" is believed to have had its earliest version dating back to 1170, but in reality, it was first published in 1737. The English epic poem "Beowulf" was first published in Latin in 1845 and in English in 1849. Most likely, all the above-mentioned epics were written much later, in the 17th or 18th centuries, and are stylized literary works designed to appear ancient. The young, emerging nations were in great need of such literature. In order for a newly invented history to take the place of the former imperial history, it was not enough to just write new books and falsify ancient documents. First and foremost, all written sources that contradicted this fabrication had to be destroyed. A real terror was organized against the wrong books and wrong authors. Tens of thousands of books recognized as wrong were thrown into a fire of the Inquisition. There were many more such books than the works recognized as canonical. Beginning in 1559, the infamous Index of Forbidden Books was compiled in the Vatican. Not only were individual books condemned, but also the authors of these books. If at least one book by a writer was included in the index, then other works by the same author were subject to mandatory search and destruction. For example, in the book "The Kingdom of the Slavs" by Mavro Orbini, there is a list of authors and primary sources he used. Today, most of these authors are unknown. Many of them are marked with the annotation "dannato autore", which means "condemned author." In addition to the main list of banned books, lists of cleansed or subject-to-cleansing books were compiled, which is to say, subject to partial correction. Special commissions had the right to censor any part of the text, prohibit publications, conduct searches in bookstores and printing houses, inspect bales of books at the border. Commissioners of the Holy Tribunal were stationed in all harbors, who allowed unloading only after verifying that there were no forbidden books on board. The Inquisition seized forbidden books not only from mere mortals but also from people of status. In 1602 in Spain, the Inquisition raided the library of the queen's personal spiritual advisor. The Spanish king begged humbly to leave him a few forbidden books. The Grand Inquisitor personally compiled a list of literary works that the king was allowed to read. The mass burning of books continued until the written memory of the Great Empire was destroyed. Today, there is no comprehensive atlas of all the ancient geographical maps that have survived to this day. Only individual maps or atlases are occasionally published in different countries. However, often these maps lack detailed enlargements of faded or erased details, which frequently contain very important information for researchers. The first geographical descriptions of countries and continents were not scientific maps in the modern

sense of the word, but only brief lists. The next step in the development of cartography was the representation of maps in the form of a circle, divided into three continents: Europe, Asia, and Africa. Within each sector, corresponding countries and peoples were listed. With the development of coastal navigation, that is, sailing along the coasts, maps with approximate outlines of countries appeared. And finally in the 15th-16th centuries, with the beginning of the Age of Exploration, did countries and seas on maps begin to acquire accurate outlines, and geographical descriptions became more detailed. Interestingly, on the geographical maps of the 15th-16th centuries, the same names of different territories, settlements, and rivers often appear. The reason is that the Great Empire, spreading its conquests, transferred Russian-Turkish geographical names to colonized lands. And this is not surprising. The conquerors came to undeveloped lands and called new places by names familiar to them, in memory of their distant homeland. But in the 17th-18th centuries, a new version of world history began to be created and implemented in Europe and Russia. The historians of the Scaligerian school began to erase the history of the Great Empire from the chronicles. Many imperial names either disappeared from geographical maps altogether or moved to other places. For example, the Evangelical Jerusalem. Jerusalem, described in the New Testament, or as we call it, the Evangelical Jerusalem, was the capital of the Byzantine, or more precisely, the Tsargrad Empire, of the 11th-13th centuries. When the Scaligerian historians began to create an erroneous, incorrect version of history, they needed to distort the history of the Tsargrad kingdom. To do this, they claimed that Jerusalem, described in the Gospels, was allegedly located on the territory of modern-day Palestine. Another example is the history of Veliky Novgorod. For more than three centuries this city was not only the capital of Russia but also the capital of the entire Great Medieval Russian Empire which included Europe and many other lands almost all of Eurasia. Generally speaking Yaroslavl was referred to as Veliky Novgorod the city of Yaroslavl on the Volga, according to our reconstruction. However in a more general sense the entire Vladimir-Suzdal Russia was also called Veliky Novgorod, the capital region of the Great Empire with its center in Yaroslavl which included other cities that served as royal headquarters. Unlike Yaroslavl, where the administrative services of the empire were located, the royal headquarters where the royal court was situated were in different places such as Suzdal, in Vladimir for a very long time, in Alexandrovskaya Sloboda and so on. All of this was Vladimir-Suzdal Russia. However later in the 17th and 18th centuries when historians falsified Russian history, Veliky Novgorod was moved on paper from the banks of the Volga to the banks of the Volkhov in the northwest corner of Russia. Thanks to such manipulations, many old names of Russian territories ended up in other countries and even on other continents. The name Mongolia was moved to the Gobi Desert. India began to be called a country on the Hindustan Peninsula. The Chinese also received some Russian names. All of this geographical map manipulation was done exclusively on paper in the offices. Then, missionary reformers armed with new maps arrived in Africa or Asia and told the local inhabitants what their country was called in ancient times. Presumably, at first, the locals shrugged their shoulders in confusion, but over time, they agreed. And for those who found the stories of the missionaries unconvincing, the reformers always had fires and other persuasive means at hand. It is likely that the process of remaking geographical maps was completed only in the 19th century. A special place in the study of ancient geographical maps is occupied by the question of their dating. After all, many maps simply do not indicate the year of their creation. However, historians confidently assign them, for example, to the 14th or 15th centuries, or to the 16th century. But it is quite obvious that these maps now need to be re-dated. Numerous cases of forgery of written documents and

alterations of geographical maps seriously call into question the correctness of their dating. Until 1991, many considered Anatoly Fomenko and Gleb Nosovsky's version of the existence and destruction of a world empire and the global falsification of world history to be interesting but unlikely. The scale of the conspiracy seemed too big, but after the collapse of the USSR, millions of people living in the post-Soviet space saw with their own eyes that after the collapse of the empire, falsification of history becomes inevitable. In order to divide the peoples who lived for centuries in one state, it is simply necessary to instill the idea of their independence and self-sufficiency. Those who still do not believe in the conspiracy against world history, should simply open textbooks that are published in the former Soviet republics: Ukraine, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia. What is written in these textbooks goes against not only genuine historical facts, but also against common sense, and sometimes international laws. Unfortunately, a whole generation of young people has already been educated on these textbooks. And this is in our time, when any information can be transmitted almost instantly. It seems that nothing can be concealed, let alone falsified. But it turns out that everything depends not only on access to information, but also on its content and presentation. If human consciousness can be manipulated in the age of television, the internet, and mobile communications, what can we say about people who lived 300-400 years ago? And today, as in those distant years, new rulers of new states change religion, trying to detach it from its roots. For example, in Ukraine, they forcibly try to create their own Patriarchate, separating the Orthodox Church from the Moscow Patriarchate. They strengthen other religions, primarily the Catholic one, create a new language, filling the former common Ukrainian with Polish words and abandoning the Russian language. They rewrite history, inventing new heroes and new myths. What is happening is exactly what happened in the years of the collapse of the Russian-Horde world empire in the 17th century. We have only told about a very small fraction of those historical fabrications that have been carried out over the past few centuries. In our upcoming parts, we will repeatedly return to the topic of falsification of history and present new evidence for it.

## Crafts and counterfeits

In Falsification of Written History, we talked about the global falsification of history using the example of forging ancient written sources and literary works. However, blatant forgeries are not limited to written documents. Many other fake objects of material culture, such as paintings, sculptures, fake religious artifacts, and supposedly ancient artifacts have been mistakenly or intentionally attributed to the world's cultural heritage. Some were intentionally made to look old, while others were simply dated incorrectly, but both types still prevent most of us from forming a correct understanding of human history. The world's largest museums house hundreds of thousands of exhibits. Historians and archaeologists attribute a significant portion of these objects to either the beginning of the Common era or to the pre-Christian era. Most museum visitors trust the guides, usually without paying attention to the fact that their stories often contradict not only historical facts but even elementary logic. Let's take a fresh look at some well-known historical monuments. Hundreds of sculptural images of great figures of the past have survived to this day. Almost all of them are made at a high artistic level, with beautiful marble, superb sculptural technique, high-quality images, and almost always very good preservation. Looking at them, it is impossible not to

notice that they are all made in a single style, although historians date them to different centuries of antiquity. Here is Socrates, here is Zeus, and this is Alexander the Great, Caligula, Charlemagne. In addition, many sculptures depict people with clean-shaven, well-groomed faces, such as the sculptures of Caesar and Nero. But they supposedly lived in extreme antiquity, in the 4th and 5th centuries BC. How did they shave? Iron and steel only appeared in the Middle Ages, and it is quite difficult, if not impossible, to use bronze products for these purposes. However, historians are not at all embarrassed by this fact. They continue to assert that both Nero and Caesar lived before the Common era. It is interesting, how did the historians determine whose busts and sculptures these were and when they were made? After all, as a rule, they do not have names or dates. Unfortunately, very often one has to realize that most of the dating is based on nothing at all. Historians often just guess whose image it is. For example, let us consider a well-known cameo, known as the Great Cameo of France. It is not just an ordinary cameo, but a famous supposedly ancient work of art. Today we are told that Tiberius and Livia are depicted in the center of the cameo. The man in armor is supposedly Germanicus, and his mother, Antonia, is next to him. In the upper level, the emperor Augustus is depicted among the assembly of gods. This is probably why this supposedly ancient cameo was once called the Apotheosis of Augustus. But the cameo doesn’t have any legend attached to it. So how did specialists determine who exactly is depicted here? Perhaps they compared the facial features of the people depicted on the cameo with images of specific historical figures? They compared the facial contours, the hairstyle, and the shape of the eyes. But where did they get their authentic images? After all, as we know, no lifetime portraits of ancient rulers have survived. It is possible that after some time, historians will authoritatively declare that this cameo depicts not Tiberius, but, for example, Constantine the Great. Their imagination is not limited. If the origin of even such works as the Great Cameo of France is unknown in the Scaligerian history, then perhaps historians would be better off admitting that there is still much they do not know, rather than pretending to be unquestionable authorities? There is another interesting fact that draws attention to itself. All supposed ancient statues were made with a great knowledge of human anatomy. But the thing is that people acquired this knowledge only in the era of active development of medicine. From the history of anatomy, it is known that the first realistic and detailed description of the human body appeared in 1534. It was a book by the surgeon Andreas Vesalius, On the Fabric of the Human Body in Seven Books. Earlier authors had a good idea of the human skeleton, but the location of the muscles was poorly known. This was due to religious prohibitions. It was forbidden to make skeletons and conduct autopsies of the deceased. The use of dead human bodies for studying the structure of the human body became possible only from the 16th century. This was achieved by the anatomists of the Renaissance. They even received permission to conduct public autopsies. For this, the first anatomical theaters were created. Leonardo da Vinci is considered to be the founder of this practice. Initially, he became interested in anatomy as an artist, but later became passionate about it as a scientist and was one of the first to dissect human corpses to study the structure of the human body. It is believed that it was Leonardo's creativity that influenced the writings of Andreas Vesalius. Therefore, only in the 16th century did artists and sculptors have the opportunity to study muscle anatomy. Only by understanding how they are located under the skin did they start depicting the human body realistically. It is not surprising that in the old images from the 11th to 15th centuries, human figures are shown without any delineation of musculature, that is, they are quite conventional. And now let's look at the ostensibly ancient sculptures. This statue called Discobolus was supposedly completed in the 5th century BC. How carefully the ancient

sculptors conveyed all the details of the structure of the human body. It is obvious that they already knew the location of the muscles well. Another example is the famous marble sarcophagus from Sidon, named the Alexander sarcophagus. Historians claim that this work was created in the late 4th century BC. The long sides of the sarcophagus are decorated with reliefs depicting the battle of Alexander the Great's army with the Persians. The large composition consists of figures in full motion, very convincingly conveying the heat of the battle. The figures depicted on the sarcophagus have been very well preserved. Only the details made of metal and some parts of the warriors' weapons have been lost. And here we see that the human figures are made in exact accordance with anatomy. When you look at these sculptures, the question involuntarily arises. If even in the 15th century artists still did not know the location of musculature, then where did this knowledge come from in earlier times? Perhaps antiquity was the heyday of not only art, but also medicine. Therefore, ancient sculptors could easily have studied the structure of the human body. But why then was this knowledge subsequently lost? Most likely, all these supposedly ancient monuments were not made before the Common era, but in the era of the Reformation when the Scaligerian version of history was being actively introduced. Moreover, they were made in just a few European workshops. At this time, the release of the new history textbooks began, which had to be supplemented with visual aids on the beautiful antiquity. This seems complicated only at first glance, because the number of truly outstanding ancient works is not so great. They could easily have been made in a few decades. During the Renaissance, there were sculptors who literally specialized in such forgeries. One of them even earned the nickname Antico, which means Ancient. Even the great Michelangelo became known thanks to a forgery. A young and unknown Michelangelo created The Sleeping Cupid statue, and a certain Baldassare del Milanese suggested reselling it as an antique original. The deal went well, and the statuette gained great fame. The forgery was soon discovered, but Michelangelo arrived in Rome already as a celebrity, a sculptor who had, so to speak, risen to the mastery of supposed ancient sculptors. It was during this period that the young man received his first major orders. In 1864, the antiquities collector De Nalivo brought an ancient bust of the poet Girolamo Benivieni from Florence. The bust was sold at auction for a fortune and ended up in the Louvre. But in 1867, it was discovered that the sculptor Giovanni Bastianini was actually the author of the bust. A huge scandal erupted, especially among professionals who were outraged. As a result, the sculpture was transferred to the Decorative Arts Department. The author of a whole series of antiques, so-called products of the ancient era, was the sculptor Israel Rukhomovsky. But he gained worldwide fame for the tiara of Saitapharnes, which in 1895 he sold to the Louvre as an authentic Greek artifact dating back to the third century BC. The French paid Rukhomovsky 200,000 francs for this forgery. When it was revealed that the figures on the tiara had been copied from drawings in a cultural history atlas, Rukhomovsky claimed authorship. However, experts at the museum refused to believe him until he presented his series of antiques. After this scandal, the Louvre management ordered the crown to be placed in the modern Decorative Arts Department. Unfortunately, this was not the only forgery purchased by the Louvre. In 1939, the museum acquired a supposed ancient Scythian drinking horn. However, the Historical Museum in Moscow had already purchased the same horn in 1908. Both of these items came from the workshop of the Gokhman brothers in Ochakov. They ran a firm that produced such forgeries on commission for jewelers. The firm's clients included museums in Russia, Germany, France, England, Greece, and Italy. They created a network of figureheads. For example, a certain peasant woman named Anyuta from the village of Perutino often visited museums, offering to sell her

antiques. At the same time, she very convincingly and in great detail described how and where she found these items. And one collector was even given the opportunity by the Gokhman firm to make a find himself. Digging up an ancient burial site, the collector supposedly stumbled upon a unique ancient artifact. In reality, of course, it was a fake that the Gokhman brothers had planted in the tomb in advance. But the famous Alceo Dossena was considered the king of ancient falsification. He was a brilliant forger who made so-called Athenian statues in the antique style, sculptures in the Gothic style, marble sarcophagi, and figurines dating back three thousand years. His workshop flooded the world market with fake antiques for many years. In private collections and museums in Europe and America, sculptures created in Dossena's workshop could be found. They were considered the works of Donatello, Verrocchio, da Fiesole, Rossellino, and other luminaries of the Renaissance era. In 1927, Dossena came forward and exposed himself. Needless to say, he was not believed. The last of the non-believers were convinced by a film made in Dossena's workshop. In front of the camera, the sculptor calmly created his final, this time legal forgery; an antique statue of a goddess. However, very often museums are not interested in impartial investigation of so-called ancient finds and refuse to listen to the candid confessions of fraudsters. The work of forgers can be found not only within the walls of museums but also in ancient temples. One of the most scandalous falsifications in recent times was the forgery of frescoes in the Hospital of the Holy Spirit and in the Church of St. Mary in the German city of Lübeck. Due to the bombings in 1942, part of the plaster in the church collapsed. Underneath it, a painting from the 13th century was revealed. After the war, in 1948, they decided to restore the frescoes, inviting a certain Dietrich Fey as a restorer. It was a rather strange choice because Fey had previously been convicted of forging works of art. This restorer also enlisted the help of Lothar Malskat, also a major specialist in forgery. After the restoration was completed, Fey and Malskat announced that they had managed to uncover ancient paintings on the walls of the church choir, hidden by later layers. After three years of work, on the 700th anniversary of Lübeck, the restored church and hospital were triumphantly opened. A postage stamp was even issued to commemorate the event. These frescoes would still probably have been considered authentic if the city authorities had rewarded both restorers for their work. But only Dietrich Fey received a reward, and Malskat received nothing. He was greatly offended and confessed that at Fey's order, he had knocked down the 13th-century frescoes and painted new ones based on preserved photographs. A special commission examined the frescoes and declared that Malskat was lying. Then the virtuoso restorer asked the members of the commission to look more closely at the faces of the saints. The commission looked and gasped in awe. The saints had the faces of Genghis Khan, Rasputin, Marlene Dietrich, and even Malskat's own sister. The scandal grew, and the commission discovered other masterpieces of the restorers. In particular, fake frescoes in the Church of St. Catherine in the same Lübeck. By the way, it turned out that Malskat did not even knock down the ancient frescoes, but painted directly on them. Unfortunately, it was not possible to restore the 13th-century painting afterward. In the history of architecture, not only is material forgery often encountered, but also chronological forgery. Historians deliberately increase the age of some ancient buildings by hundreds of years. A typical example of this is the Cologne Cathedral. In addition to its magnificent architecture, it is known for the fact that the remains of the three wise men, also known as the Magi, who were the first to come to worship the newborn Jesus and the Virgin Mary, are kept here in a special shrine. The construction of the cathedral was believed to have begun in 1248. Historians even give the exact date: August 15, 1248. Presumably, the construction of the cathedral lasted more than three hundred years and was completed around

1560. In publications about the history of the Cologne Cathedral, it is written that after the 16th century, the cathedral was only partially restored, but in general its appearance hardly changed. However, this statement by historians, to put it mildly, does not correspond to reality. This is the plan of the Cologne Cathedral, presented in a brochure that can be obtained from the church staff. It clearly shows which parts of it were built in the Middle Ages and which in the 19th and even 20th centuries. The author of the brochure is Professor Arnold Wolf. So, the oldest masonry, as historians claim, from the period of 1248 to 1560, is shown on the diagram with horizontal hatching. Here it is. Remarkable. But the oldest medieval masonry makes up only a small part of the modern building, about half of the cathedral's foundation. And all the other masonry was made after 1826. It turns out that the cathedral we see today was actually built entirely in the 19th century. And the Scaliger history assures us that before our eyes is a medieval church. But on what basis? Are there any authentic medieval images of the Cologne Cathedral? Arnold Wolf's brochure contains only an 1836 engraving. Most likely, the construction of the Cologne Cathedral began around 1825 and was completed in the 1830s. That is, it was built for about ten years. The artist depicted the last stage of the creation of the cathedral in the engraving of 1836. Then the cathedral was restored and even rebuilt several times, but its appearance hardly changed. However, there was some ancient building on this site. It is evident on the diagram that this medieval masonry was used, including for the construction of the 19th century cathedral. The lower part of the left tower is laid with stones from the 19th century, and stones from the 13th-16th centuries are laid between them. And the upper half of this tower, as well as the second tower, by the way, was entirely built in the 19th century. This means that in the 19th century, the medieval structure located on the site of the modern Cologne Cathedral was dismantled, and its material was used for the construction of a practically new building. By the way, it is completely unclear how modern archaeologists date the fragments of medieval masonry, how they determine that these stones were laid in 1248, and these ones in 1560. There is no evidence for such dating. It is possible that these stones were laid here in the 17th or even the 18th century. In general, the age of a building cannot be judged by its appearance. While traveling the world and exploring landmarks of different countries, we should not believe everything that tour guides tell us. The rehearsed stories they repeat day after day are often unfounded and lack documentary evidence. The history of many so-called ancient monuments cannot be traced back beyond the 18th century AD. Some of them continue to be built even today, right in front of tourists. And then the guides will tell them that these walls are hundreds, or even thousands, of years old. After all, the structure looks so old. In Crimea, there are caves with a lot of natural stone that locals have always used for construction needs. And today, you can see piles of stones prepared by someone for construction or restoration work. Externally, this stone looks very old. If this wall is to be completed nonetheless, then after some time, tour guides will be able to show it to unsuspecting tourists as a structure from, for example, the 16th century. This is the coast of the Dead Sea. The ruins of the Qumran settlement, which historians date back to the 8th-6th centuries BC. Obviously, the ancient builders did not leave any plaques indicating the founding of this settlement. Therefore, archaeologists and historians, as always, themselves determined the age of the finds. When you look at the ruins up close, it is clear that the cement binding the stones was laid quite recently. It is mainly painted in terracotta for some reason, but in some places they didn't even bother to paint it. And these neat notches made when laying the cement, we apparently should take for ancient chips and cracks. Perhaps somewhere archaeologists have irrefutable evidence that these buildings were built 10 centuries ago. But what is on display for all to see looks more like a

decoration than an ancient settlement. As a rule, when visiting a particular country, tourists visit at least one museum there. Without visiting the national historical or archaeological museum, you feel as though you haven't really touched the ancient history of that state. And everything is neatly arranged and labeled in museums. A few photos and you can take a piece of antiquity with you. However, few people think about the number of forgeries that are stored in the archaeological collections of museums in different countries. Here are just a few examples. At the end of the 19th century, an assortment of Moabite figurines decorated with dots and seemingly meaningless inscriptions appeared in Jerusalem. The lot consisted of 1,700 objects. Upon the advice of experts, the Prussian government bought these figurines for 20,000 talers. However, the French orientalist Clermont-Ganneau, who had long served in the French mission in Jerusalem, declared the figurines to be forgeries. A political scandal erupted, as the collection of Moabite culture became an adornment of the Berlin Museum. But it turned out that Clermont-Ganneau was right. All these so-called antiquities were made by a company located in Jerusalem. The production of the fakes was supervised by the icon painter Selim. In 1937, a certain Gonon, plowing a field near Brizet, found a marble statue of Venus. The opinion of experts was unanimous. Venus was made in the first century BC. Only they could not determine the author; either Praxiteles or Phidias. Gonon received 250,000 for this ancient creation. And in 1938, the sculptor François Crémonèse claimed that he had buried the statue of his own making in the field two years ago. The evidence is the missing fragments. The purpose of the forgery was to show what he was capable of. A special place in the series of archaeological forgeries is occupied by forgeries of objects from the biblical period. As we showed in our Forgotten Jerusalem part, the main support for historians in the study of biblical antiquities is the science called Biblical Archaeology. But this science is quite peculiar. Its main purpose is to search for and study artifacts related to the events described in the Bible. Despite the huge number of finds made on the territory of modern Israel, historians have not received irrefutable evidence that ancient Judea was located precisely here. That modern Jerusalem is exactly the city described in the Bible. Historians have no indisputable evidence that the age of Jerusalem is indeed several thousand years. On the contrary, Jerusalem guidebooks say that the buildings of the old city were built no earlier than the 14th century AD. As for the sensational biblical finds made in these territories, they often cause problems and even scandals. Israeli courts periodically hear cases of falsified artifacts. As a rule, items that fall under suspicion are recognized as forgeries. These are not only well-known and high-profile forgeries such as the King Solomon’s Tablet of Stone or the James Ossuary. Numerous counterfeit seals, coins, and figurines have been discovered that became museum exhibits. But in addition to both exposed and still unexposed forgeries, museums around the world store many items that historians modestly call copies. These copies are allegedly made from lost originals for various reasons. Museum visitors have no way to verify what is displayed in these showcases: genuine articles, copies, or outright forgeries? They have to take the word of historians and tour guides. Throughout history, not only secular items have been frequently falsified but sacred objects as well. In the Middle Ages, people were ignorant and didn’t travel a lot. In the best case, they only knew by hearsay about the holy relics kept in other lands and countries. But at the same time, they were devout and did not doubt the authenticity of the relics. And that is what the fraudsters took advantage of. The strongest emotions for believing Christians are caused by relics associated with Jesus Christ, including fragments of the True Cross. It is believed that together with other relics, pieces of the Holy Cross were brought by crusaders who returned from their campaign to Constantinople. Today, there are so many of these fragments scattered around the world that if

they were all put together, it would be possible to assemble not one, but several crosses. Throughout history, people have held a special reverence for the remains of holy martyrs and righteous men. And in ancient times as well as today, there have been many cases of believers being healed after worshiping the holy relics. But, unfortunately, among genuine relics, there were also forgeries. Fraudsters have never been afraid to offend people's religious feelings. But forgers produced fakes not only of Christian relics. In the late 1970s, French archaeologist André Lemaire discovered in one of the antique shops an object of a religious cult, which was supposedly used in the Temple of King Solomon in Jerusalem. It was a pomegranate fruit carved from ivory. Scientists assumed that the bone pomegranate was used as the top of a scepter carried by the temple priest. This was evidenced by the inscription on it in ancient Hebrew, Holy to the Priest of the House of God. Historians dated this object to the eighth century BC. The pomegranate passed from one owner to another until it was acquired by the Israeli Museum in 1988. This item was considered a very fortunate acquisition, as it was believed to be the only item remaining from the First Temple. Perhaps the bone pomegranate would still be considered authentic if not for the results of the work of the Investigative Committee of Israel and the country's police, who exposed the forgers of antiquities. For several months, art experts carefully studied the exhibit using the latest technology and concluded that it was a fake. To date, the list of various religious forgeries is quite long, and, unfortunately, it continues to grow. It is well known that in the ancient historical centers of coin minting, workshops producing counterfeit coins subsequently emerged, minting coins common to the region. Today, thousands of such counterfeits are known. For example, in the 16th century, the firm of the Italian Giovanni Covino released a large number of counterfeit ancient coins onto the market. After he was exposed, it was revealed that entire series of these counterfeits were stored in various museums around the world. And in the 19th century, a counterfeiter who lived in Germany made 622 stamps used to mint counterfeit Roman aurei and denarii. These counterfeits littered many museum collections until the beginning of the 20th century. For over two hundred years, the study of coins and the identification of fakes has been the domain of the science of numismatics. Compared to other sciences, numismatics was formed relatively late, in the late 18th century. By this time, the Scaligerian chronology had already been finalized and established. Therefore, it is quite understandable that numismatics rests on the traditional version of history and is intended to documentarily confirm it. Although this is quite difficult to do, as the dating of coin minting is quite rare. For example, dates appear on Russian coins only in 1596. And they were indicated not by numbers, but by Slavic letters. And dates on ancient coins are generally an exceptional case. Therefore, specialists mainly date ancient coins based on indirect signs, such as the personalities depicted on them or their affiliation with a particular state. Over the 200 years of the existence of numismatics as a science, enormous catalogs have been compiled with detailed descriptions of coins from different countries and eras. Therefore, today, when determining the age of each found coin, archaeologists necessarily use these catalogs. They find coins in the catalog that are similar in description and date the found coin to the same era as the coin from the catalog. There is no absolute method for dating coins. Specialists claim that there were several periods in the history of coins. First, there was supposedly, an ancient heyday, then for some reason, the dark ages of medieval period set in. From the 8th to the 13th century, the regular issuance of gold coins allegedly completely ceased throughout Western Europe. Then this period was replaced by the splendid flowering of the Renaissance. However, after the brilliant period of the Roman Empire of the 1st-6th centuries AD, the stagnation in Roman coinage, which lasted almost 6 centuries, looks quite

strange. Another fact is also surprising, antique gold coins do not differ in quality and intricacy from similar coins of the 13th-17th centuries. It creates the impression that all the so-called antique coins of Western Europe were minted after the 15th century AD, and then thrown by the Scaligerian chronology back in to the distant past. The fact that antique coins were minted no earlier than the 13th century AD is evidenced by another aspect. Most of the known allegedly antique coins are unique coins, that is, existing only as a single example. But for the monetary system of any state, unique coins are absurd. Money should be widespread; otherwise, it makes no sense. Making individual examples is only profitable for counterfeiters because a large number of identical coins reduces their collectible value and increases the risk of the counterfeiter being exposed. Naturally, a unique coin is the dream of any numismatist. But in private and museum collections, individual copies are so common that one gets the impression that in ancient times, coins were deliberately minted in single copies to satisfy the demands of collectors of future centuries. And instead of acknowledging that the majority of these supposedly ancient coins were counterfeit, historians came up with a rather original explanation for their appearance. It turns out that in ancient times, anyone who feels like it, could mint coins. For example, historians claim that the philosopher Pythagoras and the moralist Joshua ben Sirach supposedly minted their own coins at the market, using different stamps. How to otherwise explain that the earliest European treasure-troves, containing a large number of identical coins, are dated by historians to the reign of Charlemagne, and this is in the 8-9th century AD, even according to the Scaligerian chronology. In traditional history, it is not only the development of coin minting in Western Europe that looks strange. The same can be said for Russian coins. The quality of gold and silver coins supposedly from the 10th-11th centuries is simply magnificent. The details are beautifully drawn, the shape is correct, and they are well-preserved. The coins of Sviatopolk are slightly worse preserved, but the quality of minting is still beyond praise. Coins from the next period of Russian history, during the reign of Yaroslav the Wise, are also beautifully made. It is believed that the mastery of Yaroslav's silver coin stamps is a phenomenon in 11th century European coin production. In Scaliger's chronology, this phenomenon appears suddenly, like a flash, and seemingly out of nowhere. Coin minting begins immediately at the highest level. But where are the preceding coins? The first samples, rough and primitive, from which coin production should have started. They are somehow missing. But what is most surprising is that after supposedly a brief, brilliant rise, coin minting suddenly stops. Historians explain this by the fact that the population of Russia regressed to a primitive way of life. The Russian people supposedly abandoned commodity-money relations and returned to natural exchange. This led to a so-called coinless period, which lasted for about 300 years. In the 14th century, coinage began again in Russia, but these were somehow rough and primitive coins, called wire money. All of them were small, of irregular shape, and made from rough silver scraps. It is quite obvious that skewed dies were used in their production. The stamp struck the edge of the ingot, and only a few letters were imprinted on it. Therefore, the quality of coinage was very primitive. Only among the coins of the 17th century, issued under Tsar Alexei Mikhailovich, do specimens of good quality begin to appear again. But even at that time, there was still a lot of wire money. In terms of quality, they differed little from the wire money from the time of Dmitry Donskoy. Despite the fact that historians come up with different reasons for the cessation of coinage, there was probably no coinless period in Russia or Western Europe. In fact, these primitive stampings were the first coins. The art of coinage, like any other art, developed gradually and only over time reached perfection. Most likely, Russian coins began to be minted no earlier than the 14th century. And before that, if coins were minted in

Russia, they were very rough and primitive. In this respect, Russia did not stand out among other states. In Europe, mass coinage also began around the 14th-15th centuries. It is known that throughout history, forgers have been involved in creating not only counterfeit masterpieces. The manufacture of cheap fakes has been thriving for a long time. But the boom in producing cheap fakes began in the late 19th century. At that time, there was a fascination with tourism. A stream of Americans flooded into Europe and Asia, buying up anything they could get their hands on. This American craze for collecting was even reflected in the works of O. Henry and Mark Twain. Money flowed from tourists' wallets into the pockets of various swindlers. Today, it is impossible to determine how many fake ancient papyri, coins, stone figurines, and clay jars were sold, and how many of them are still stored in the collections of deceived antique seekers. Not only ordinary travelers, but also experts, could not always distinguish genuine antiquity from forgery. Once, the German art historian Julius Meier-Graefe was examining local attractions in Egypt. Together with his guide, he found what he thought was an ancient statuette in the sand. Returning to his hotel, he decided to show his find to a nearby merchant. The merchant invited him in and showed him several statuettes which were exactly the same. The owner of the shop had received them from a commercial agent in Cairo. It turned out that these statuettes were made in Silesia, in the town of Bunzlau. And the local guide who accompanied the art historian had long been specializing in such pseudo-findings. However, not only a hundred years ago, but even today, resourceful locals can perform an old trick in front of tourists. For example, digging up at the foot of the pyramids an ancient Egyptian figurine, or some other item, supposedly preserved from the time of the pharaohs, and selling it as a unique find then and there. In the 1920s, such archaeological finds were being cranked out all over Europe, today it’s somewhere in China. Not only visitors to the pyramids in Giza, but also tourists who have visited other places, such as Pompeii or Rome, can tell similar stories. And even for those who do not believe in the authenticity of supposedly ancient finds, the scammers have another trick up their sleeve. A skeptical tourist may unexpectedly find an ancient Roman coin that supposedly rolled into a crevice between the stones of the Colosseum two thousand years ago and lay there until today. Unfortunately, today the number of fakes in the world is so great that no one can be sure of the authenticity of their purchase. Neither the tourist, buying a supposedly genuine Egyptian papyrus for a pittance, nor the collector who accidentally found an ancient rarity in a small antique shop, nor the professional art expert acquiring an exhibit that has passed numerous expert examinations, for one of the largest museums. A forgery may turn out to be not only in an Arab trader's shop, but even at an auction at the world-renowned London firm Sotheby's. Today, there are many methods that specialists use to determine the authenticity and age of historical monuments and archaeological artifacts. However, unfortunately, none of them are absolute or universal. Moreover, very often the assessment of the authenticity of these objects is based on extremely subjective opinions of researchers and experts. This has often led to catastrophic errors. After all, forgeries are often introduced unnoticed into life. And if a forgery is not exposed during the lifetime of one generation, then over time it becomes an original, because for posterity it has already been consecrated by time and the authority of previous owners. Today, not everyone knows that falsifiers of history have falsified not only sculptures, coins, or documents. Forgeries can also be found among famous architectural and archaeological monuments. Some of them have even been declared World Heritage Sites by UNESCO.

## Three Great Forgeries

In the previous part, we talked about how historical documents, literary works, ancient artifacts, and works of art were falsified. Medieval reformers erased the true past of humanity from the pages of history, replacing it with fiction and half-truths. This was a long process that lasted more than one century. However, it was not enough to provide only written documents to introduce a new history into the consciousness of the people. It was necessary to provide material evidence of the new historical version. And following the editing and forgery of written documents, the process of falsifying monuments of material culture began. Sometimes the process of falsifying historical monuments was carried out on a state level, and sometimes it was the work of a small group of people. Some of them were eager for money, some for fame, and some were simply carrying out a specific order. Since the 16th century, a huge number of all kinds of forgeries have been produced. Unfortunately, this process is not yet over and continues to this day. This part will tell about three high-profile stories of falsification of historical monuments. History is all around us. Any building, any object that has survived to our present day has its own historical value. And the older these objects are, the more they attract people's attention. That is why, among so-called antiquities, there are many fakes. Today it is well known that there are counterfeit paintings, jewelry, coins, and seals. Numerous fake documents and chronicles have been discovered. But not everyone knows that among the famous architectural and archaeological monuments, there are also fakes. Some of them have even been declared World Heritage Sites. Because the grander the forgery, the easier it is to convince people of its authenticity. For several centuries now, most people have learned about the Great Troy from Homer's Iliad. The poem is called Iliad because the Greeks called this city Ilion. The Trojan War is believed to have taken place in the 13th century BC. Historians claim that Homer was not a contemporary of the Trojan War, but lived seven hundred years later. At the same time, he wrote his poem supposedly based on oral traditions and songs of wandering minstrels. There are no written documents or historical records that have survived about Troy and the legendary Trojan War. Moreover, traditional historians claim that Homer was blind. Therefore, he could not have written his poems himself. He could only dictate them to someone else. But during his lifetime, no one sought to perpetuate these works. Over the centuries, they were supposedly passed down through oral tradition and were only written down several hundreds of years after the poet's death. It is not surprising that most scholars and educated people until the end of the 19th century perceived Homer's poem only as an epic and Troy itself as a mythical city. But at the end of the 19th century, many people's attitudes changed because the German amateur archaeologist Heinrich Schliemann supposedly managed to find the ruins of Homer's Ilion. Schliemann's biography romantically describes how the young Heinrich from childhood dreamed of finding the legendary Troy. Growing up, Schliemann became a successful millionaire businessman and could afford such a costly enterprise as searching for a lost city. Let's take a closer look at the details of the search for Troy. There is a widespread myth that Schliemann searched for Troy holding a copy of Homer's work, relying solely on the text of the Iliad. However, this is not the case. Schliemann arrived in Turkey following in someone else's footsteps, primarily those of the French scholar Choiseul-Gouffier, who made several expeditions to the northwestern Antalya province in Turkey in the 18th century. The Frenchman published a description of this area and claimed that Troy was located approximately 10 kilometers from the Hissarlik hill. In 1822, Scottish journalist Charles Maclaren published an article

claiming that the Hissarlik hill was the ancient Troy. The first excavations of the hill were conducted by an Englishman, named Frank Calvert in the 1820s. However, Calvert ran out of funds before he could complete his work. Schliemann, on the other hand, had the resources to finish the job. Schliemann wrote: After having twice carefully studied the entire plain of Troy, I now agree wholeheartedly with Calvert's conviction that the plateau at Hissarlik is the site of the Pergamos of Troy. Why did scholars start searching for ancient Troy specifically here? In the 18-19th centuries, there were still medieval records that the ancient Troy was located within the territory of the Ottoman Empire. But the fact is, that Turkey is densely covered with the ruins of ancient settlements and military fortifications. Almost anywhere, one can find fragments of ancient buildings. And it is completely incomprehensible why the remains of a settlement found on Hissarlik hill were declared as ancient Troy with such enthusiasm. After all, there was nothing Homeric there. When the ruins were cleared of the earth, it turned out that the size of the settlement was only 120 by 120 meters. It's like two football fields. For anyone who has read Homer's poem, it's entirely obvious that the territory of the city depicted by the poet was much larger. It was then decided to declare that Troy consists of several archaeological layers. Allegedly, the very first settlement was located on such a small piece of land. And then the city gradually grew, and Troy, during the time of the famous Trojan War, occupied supposedly 20,000 square meters. But even in such a space, more than 500 people could hardly live at the same time. After all, in addition to dwellings and internal roads, there had to be temples, warehouses, and spaces for livestock somewhere. Homer, describing the siege of Troy which lasted for 10 years, tells us that over a thousand Greek ships arrived to storm the city. This means that the number of warriors besieging Troy was about 30,000. If this small fortress was really Troy, then it is obvious that under the pressure of such an impressive Greek army, the Trojans would not have held out for even a week. It is likely that historians and archaeologists understood that the size of the settlement, even at 20,000 square meters, did not correspond to the description of Homeric Troy. Therefore, the dimensions have been increased. In 2003, German archaeologist Manfred Korfmann, who is now considered the most authoritative expert on Troy, stated that he was able to establish the authentic size of the city. According to him, the area of the presumed Troy is 13 times larger than commonly thought. That is, it is not 20,000 square meters, but 217,000. Starting in 1988, Korfmann conducted excavations here for 15 years, which cost 3 million Euros. However, despite the fact that thanks to the efforts of German archaeologists and their sponsors, this settlement increased in size, there is still no evidence that the legendary Troy is located on Hissarlik hill. Ancient ruins are ubiquitous in modern Turkey. Therefore, Schliemann, who began his excavations on Hissarlik Hill, needed tangible evidence that the city he found was indeed Troy. And it was found. In May 1873, Schliemann unexpectedly found a buried treasure that he confidently declared as the treasure of the Trojan king Priam. However, the circumstances under which the treasure was found raise serious suspicions. Firstly, initially Schliemann could not even name the day when the discovery was made and only named the month, May. Could he really forget such a significant date? After all, if his biography is to be believed, he had been preparing for this day since childhood. Later he did provide a date: May 27, 1873. Secondly, Schliemann initially claimed that his wife Sophia was the only witness to the discovery of the treasure-trove. But later it turned out that Mrs. Schliemann had left Turkey in early May and could not have been a witness to this historic event. Faced with this fact, Schliemann admitted that supposedly, he wanted his wife to be considered a co-discoverer. Thirdly, doubts about the authenticity of the treasure are reinforced by another extremely curious fact. It turns out that

Schliemann was looking for jewelers who would make copies of the found gold jewelry. He had specific requirements for the jewelers. These people had to be knowledgeable about antiquities, not put their own mark on the copies, charge a reasonable price for the work, and most importantly, not reveal Schliemann's involvement. Schliemann explained his desire to make duplicates by stating that the Turkish government was unlikely to forget about its share of the treasures. And if half of the findings were returned, Schliemann would still have the copies. But Schliemann's entire activity is shrouded in such darkness that it is completely unclear when he was negotiating with the jewelers. Was it after the treasure was found, or before? Most likely, the treasure that he discovered alone on the hill of Hissarlik was nothing more than the work of the skilled jewelers of the 19th century. Fourthly, Schliemann's claim that he found the treasures of the legendary king Priam looked rather strange. Making such a statement was at least irresponsible. Establishing an absolute date for a gold, silver, or copper item is impossible even today. One can try to make a connection to some historical era if there are inscriptions, names, titles, or numbers on the objects. But there is not a single letter on the items found by Schliemann. And this is despite the fact that Schliemann claimed to have found 8833 items. Most of the treasure consisted of beads, chains, buttons, clasps, and fragments of daggers. But there were also goblets made of gold, vessels, household copper and bronze utensils, two gold diadems, and silver flasks. Fifthly, the operation to export the supposedly found treasures from the Ottoman Empire was very suspicious. Schliemann prepared the operation plan in advance and kept it strictly secret. The treasures were packed in six wooden boxes and secretly transported to the house of British consul Frank Calvert, the same Frank Calvert who began excavations of the supposed Homeric Troy. Then the treasures were taken to Anit Limani harbor, located five kilometers north of Hissarlik. Here, the chartered ship Taxiarchis was already waiting for them. With the help of Schliemann's trusted people, the ship arrived at the island of Syros. Then the priceless cargo was transferred to another ship, which delivered it to Athens. All of this was genuine smuggling, because under the terms of the agreement between Schliemann and the Turkish government, half of all the treasures found belonged to the Ottoman Empire. But Schliemann was not going to part with the treasure. He explained the contraband transportation of the find abroad by saying that ignorant Turks would simply melt down these unique treasures. But perhaps the operation to export the treasures was just a show. Instead of Priam's treasure, Schliemann may have packed some items into the wooden boxes that were found at the site of these ruins, but did not have any special value. It is believed that in addition to the so-called treasures of Priam, Heinrich Schliemann also discovered an ancient burial site in Mycenae. There, he discovered a gold funeral mask, which he immediately declared to be the mask of another hero from the Iliad, Agamemnon. Yet again, there was no evidence to support his claim. Today, historians say that the mask belonged to another ruler whose name is not yet known. It is interesting how archaeologists were able to prove that an unknown mask belonged to an unknown ruler whose name is also unknown. To consider some of the buildings located on this site as remnants of ancient Ilion is simply absurd. For example, archaeologists ask us to believe that the city gates were once located here. And every day, year after year, heavy loaded carts entered and exited through them. But it is well known that any road used for many years will inevitably develop ruts. This is what a stone road in the city of Chufut-Kale in Crimea, which was actually used by wagons for a long time, looks like. Sure, the depth of the ruts depends on the strength of the material used, but such a road cannot remain perfectly flat. There are no ruts from wheels, no potholes left by animal hooves, no other damage that usually appears on the surface of a road. And with such a steep slope, it would be practically

impossible for loaded wagons to go up and down the road. In addition, the road literally ends at a wall. It seems that no one ever traveled here, and this road is a sham remake. This is another interesting structure located on the territory of the archaeological complex. This wall clearly shows that the building is composed of several layers. Archaeologists claim that the foundation of the building was made two and a half thousand years before Christ. The plaque does not say when the top bricks were laid. Note that for some reason the building is covered with a canopy. When surprised tourists ask why it was done, guides answer that this way the structure is protected from rain. And indeed, the bricks are made of such fragile material that they crumble easily even from a touch. And heavy rains can turn them into a pile of mud. But how did people live in such a house? And why did they build their dwelling from such a meager material? When you carefully examine these ruins, it becomes evident that this is not actually the remains of an ancient building, but a cheap decoration, hastily made, for tourists. These are fragments of an ancient burial. It is also believed to be several thousand years old. It is amazing how the ancient builders managed to so evenly cut marble blocks and stone slabs for facing the tomb. And most importantly, what did they cut them with? The quality of the finish of this supposedly ancient tomb is practically the same as that of modern buildings. All these peculiarities and contradictions gave specialists a reason to doubt the authenticity of the treasures. To this day, many serious scholars consider the discovery of Troy to be a hoax, and Schliemann himself, a daring fantasist or just a liar. But if this is really just an ordinary military fortification, why did the archaeologists organize this high-profile falsification? For fame and money? Or perhaps they acted not solely in their own interests and someone was behind them? Today it is difficult to answer this question, but for historians of the Scaliger school, this grand forgery was very opportune. And to finally convince tourists that they are on the territory of the supposedly ancient Troy, a huge wooden horse was built at the entrance to the archaeological complex, which travelers from all over the world love to climb inside. But as it turns out, the story of the Trojan horse is just another fantastic legend in a series of fictions associated with ancient Troy. We have discovered that the Trojan War is reflected in old documents under various names, including the famous Roman–Etruscan War in the history of Rome and the famous Gothic War in the history of Byzantium and Rome. So, it turns out that in the history of the capture of Troy, according to the documents of the Gothic War, this city was taken through the old destroyed aqueduct. The troops broke into the city through the pipe of the old aqueduct. It appears that in the Homeric text the aqueduct morphed into the Trojan horse. Why? The answer, apparently, is very simple. In Latin, water is written as aqua, and horse is written as equa. Scribes confused these two words and turned the aqueduct, which once carried water, into a horse, the Trojan horse. Thus, a fanciful image was born, which has since wandered through the pages of old chronicles. For many years, the question of where the great Troy was located has been stirring the minds of scholars, adventurers, and even readers of Homer's poem. It was only a matter of time before someone uncovered the truth that Troy was actually medieval Constantinople. The only way to end these searches was to find some ruins on the shores of the Bosporus and declare them to be the ruins of Troy. Thanks to Schliemann, this task was successfully accomplished, and the search for the real Troy came to an end for many years. Though, gullible tourists flocked in droves to Hissarlik. Travelers from all over the world come here to see with their own eyes the city described by the great Homer. Unfortunately, the falsification of Troy is not the only case in the history of archaeology. In 50 years, a new sensation will sweep the world, which will overshadow even Schliemann's deeds. In November 1922, sensational news dominated the front pages of British

newspapers. In the Egyptian Valley of the Kings, a grandiose burial was found, the tomb of the pharaoh Tutankhamun. The uniqueness of this finding was not only in the wealth of the tomb. Until then, the very figure of Tutankhamun was considered mythical. Information about this person was limited to one or two seals with his name, without any indication of his royal title. Therefore, many scholars did not consider Tutankhamun a king, at best, just a noble person. But the discovery made in November 1922 changed everything. The man who discovered the tomb of Tutankhamun became the number one Egyptologist in the world. It was a professional archaeologist Howard Carter. He had been working in Egypt for several years and was considered to be quite successful. But Carter was ambitious. He intended to do what no one had done before: to find the tomb of Tutankhamun himself. In 1917, he gathered an expedition and began excavations in the Valley of the Kings. By this time, all the scholars were convinced that it was impossible to find anything significant here. German archaeologist Richard Lepsius claimed that there was not a single grain of sand left in the Valley of the Kings that had not been moved at least three times from one place to another. By 1917, all that archaeologists had found were insignificant trinkets. And Carter, as a professional, knew this. And yet, he began his search. Today, almost a hundred years later, many researchers of Egyptian antiquities suggest that Carter's discovery was not a grandiose discovery, but a grandiose hoax. For ten years, Carter was not engaged in the search and subsequent study of the tomb of Tutankhamun, but in falsification. This is not surprising, as the burial looks more like a decoration than a tomb. And a number of circumstances that accompanied his work still raise many questions. Circumstance One: Carter began excavations at the very spot where the tomb would later be found. However, at first, Carter allegedly found nothing there. Therefore, over the next five years, he meticulously meter by meter searched other areas of the Valley of the Kings. In 1922, Carter decided to return to the spot where the search had begun and immediately found the burial site. Circumstance Two: After discovering the tomb, Carter did not allow his colleagues to open the sealed doors and intentionally delayed the excavation process. He forced members of the expedition to study the already-made findings, although it would have been better to do this under laboratory conditions, rather than on site. Furthermore, Carter ordered to bury the tomb and wait for the expedition sponsor, Lord Carnarvon, to arrive. Such behavior is quite strange for an archaeologist. Circumstance Three: When the archaeologists excavated the tomb again, they found that the sealed entrance had already been opened and resealed twice before. The conclusion was obvious: the tomb had been visited by thieves twice. However, when the expedition members managed to enter the tomb, they saw a large number of objects, including many precious items. At this point, Carter made a strange decision. Instead of continuing to investigate the tomb, he ordered it to be resealed and left for Cairo. It was only in late December 1922 that the first discovery was extracted from the tomb. Carter entered the room containing the pharaoh's sarcophagus only in February 1923. It turned out that this room, filled with golden objects, had not been plundered either. No one could explain why the thieves who had visited the tomb did not take anything. Why didn’t they open the gold-plated wooden sarcophagus after breaking into the burial chamber? All finds were in excellent condition. The golden objects sparkled like new. They had not gathered dust or become tarnished in three thousand years. But it was not the only thing that looked strange. In the tomb gold coins were found, sealed in leather pouches. These leather pouches in any case should have rotted in three thousand years, but they were intact. Moreover, traces of modern tools were found on many items, including saw marks. As is known, three thousand years ago was the Bronze Age. At that time, the Egyptians did not have metal. It is doubtful that anything could have been made with bronze saws.

Such a tool hardly existed. And in the tomb was a royal chariot that could not go through the door; it simply could not be brought in. It was sawn apart. The fourth circumstance: For some reason, a narrow-gauge railway was laid to the burial site of Tutankhamun. The fifth circumstance: Surprisingly, it took an unusually long time to work in the tomb. The excavations lasted for five long years. Was it really necessary to spend so much time on inventorying the treasures, sarcophagi, and mummy that were located in an 80-square-meter area? The sixth circumstance: The burial is significantly different from other tombs located in the Valley of the Kings. In all the tombs, the vaulted ceilings are oval in shape. But Tutankhamun's burial chamber is in the form of a regular parallelepiped. All the corners here are right angles. An attentive observer will be struck by the paintings in the tomb. In all available photographs, it is deliberately taken so as to give the impression that the painting covers all the walls. This is probably because this is how other tombs in the Valley of the Kings are painted. In some of them, the painting is even done on the ceiling. But in Tutankhamun's tomb, the painting only covers the walls of the burial chamber. Moreover, the main image is right in front of the eyes of those entering the tomb. Where it is inconvenient to look, for some reason there are no paintings. One gets the impression that it was depicted specifically for tourists. There is nothing like this in other tombs. But the most interesting thing is that in the photographs that can be seen in various publications, the painting looks like it is made of gold, and it looks very old. It can be seen that many fragments have decayed or fallen off. But in reality, this painting was done with a simple yellow gold paint. And the supposedly lost fragments are just strokes of dark brown paint. In other words, this painting was originally made to look old and cannot be an authentic ancient image. Seventh circumstance: The extremely poor condition of the mummy found in the tomb is noteworthy. The so-called mummy of Tutankhamun has survived in much worse condition than the mummies of other pharaohs. Eighth circumstance: Tutankhamun's tomb is the only one in the Valley of the Kings where tourists are strictly forbidden not only to film videos but also to take pictures. At the entrance, video and photo cameras are simply taken away. Most likely, the real tomb of Pharaoh Tutankhamun never existed. The so-called excavations in the Valley of the Kings, which Carter began in the fall of 1917, were just a red herring. In reality, Carter was not looking for Tutankhamun's tomb, but building it. However, it takes time to dig up a tomb and fill it with countless treasures. Therefore, his expedition spent five years shoveling sand in the Egyptian desert from one place to another. After five years, the production of the fakes was completed, and along with authentic artifacts they began to be transported to the tomb by narrow gauge railway. When the burial chamber was filled, Carter returned to the site and almost immediately discovered the entrance to the tomb. The entrance, which had been opened and then sealed twice, was explained by the intrusion of strange ancient robbers who, upon entering the tomb, took nothing. However, in order to produce such a large quantity of gold items, a colossal amount of money was needed. It is unlikely that the expedition sponsor, Lord Carnarvon, could have paid for all of it on his own. Most likely, Carter received help from the Egyptian government, and the archaeological forgery turned into a very profitable business project. Only a small part of the alleged treasures of Tutankhamun is kept in Cairo. Most of it was sold to various museums around the world for astronomical sums of money. So if the Egyptian government lent Carter a certain amount of money, they more than recovered it. Not to mention the crowds of tourists who come to the banks of the Nile every year to see the tomb of Tutankhamun first and foremost. But why didn't any of the members of the expedition ever speak out about Carter's forgery? Did no one notice anything? And here the so-called curse of the pharaoh immediately comes to mind, which

supposedly caused the deaths of many members of Carter's expedition. Lord Carnarvon was the first to die. This happened in 1923. The lord supposedly died of blood poisoning after careless shaving. A little later, Lady Carnarvon died from a mosquito bite. Then the deaths followed one after another. Suddenly departed this life: Archibald Reid, who conducted the X-ray analysis of Tutankhamun's mummy; Mace, who opened the burial chamber together with Carter; Carter's secretary, young Lord Westbury; his father, senior Lord Westbury; and Carnarvon's half-brother, Aubrey Herbert, who committed suicide. By 1930, only Howard Carter himself remained alive among the immediate participants of the expedition. The succession of these deaths gave rise to a lot of speculation. Various versions were discussed. From heavenly retribution that befell tomb raiders, to pathogenic bacteria that ancient Egyptian priests supposedly deliberately placed in the tomb. But none of the suggested hypotheses found scientific confirmation. Therefore, to this day, the most likely explanation is that the deaths of archaeologists, which followed one after another, were simply a monstrous coincidence. However, it cannot be ruled out that both Carter's colleagues and Lord Carnarvon himself simply began to doubt the authenticity of the findings. That is why they had to be eliminated. After all, the so-called curse of the pharaoh did not befall all members of the expedition, only those who either visited the tomb or worked with the pharaoh's mummy. Many participants and scientists who worked with Carter and were not involved in this entire affair suspected that they were not dealing with a genuine burial. The first to suspect were those who conducted X-rays of the mummy. The Egyptian intelligence agencies had no choice but to quietly eliminate these people. Therefore, in my opinion, such an explanation may be logical. It is probably possible to confirm it with some kind of data, but so far it is not available, naturally. Of course, the versions of the violent deaths of the expedition members do not have irrefutable evidence. But too many strange circumstances and coincidences were associated with both the tomb of Tutankhamun and Carter himself, who safely lived until 1939 and died at home in his bed at the age of 65 from natural causes. When archaeologists retrieve their sensational finds, made surprisingly in modern times, they often pseudo-confirm the reality of completely mythical things. The question arises, what does history turn into in connection with this? Alongside entirely real people, completely mythical characters begin to coexist. Egyptology is no exception in this sense. Falsification of historical facts is also found in the history of Asian countries. For example, in the history of China. This unique structure, resembling the body of a long dragon, is the famous Great Wall of China. It stretches across all of China, with a length of more than 6,400 kilometers; a height that reaches 7 meters, and a thickness of 3 meters. It is believed that the construction of the wall began in the third century BC and was completed in the 17th century AD. That is, according to the historical version accepted today, this construction lasted almost two thousand years. Truly a unique structure; history does not know another back burner construction project like this. Everyone has become so accustomed to this historical version that few people question its absurdity. Any construction project, especially a large one, has a certain practical purpose. Who today would even think of starting a huge construction project that could only be completed in two thousand years? Obviously, no one, because it would be meaningless. Not only would this endless construction project place a heavy burden on the country's population, but the construction itself would constantly be destroyed and would have to be rebuilt. This is what happened with the Great Wall of China. We will never know what the first sections of the wall, allegedly built before the Common era, looked like. They, for sure, have collapsed. And the sections that have survived to our time were mostly built during the Ming dynasty, supposedly from the 14th to the 17th century AD. This is because in that era, the

main building materials were brick and stone blocks, which made the structure more durable. So historians are still forced to admit that this wall, which anyone can see today, appeared no earlier than the 14th century AD. But even 600 years is a very respectable age for a stone construction. It is still unclear why this structure has been so well-preserved. In Europe, for example, medieval stone fortifications aged and fell apart over time. They had to be dismantled and new, more modern ones built. The same thing happened in Russia. Many medieval military fortifications were rebuilt in the 17th century. But in China, these natural physical laws somehow did not apply. But even if we assume that ancient Chinese builders possessed some kind of secret that allowed them to create such a unique structure, historians have no logical answer to the most important question – why did the Chinese build a stone wall with such persistence for two thousand years? Who did they want to defend against? Historians answer: the wall was built along the entire border of the Chinese Empire to protect against nomadic raids. But the nomads of that time had arrows and spears with copper and even stone tips. Against such weapons, a three-meter-thick stone wall was not necessary. Russians and Europeans began building similar structures only when cannons and siege weapons appeared on the battlefields, that is, in the 15th century. But the issue is not even the thickness of the wall, but its length. A wall stretching for thousands of kilometers could not protect China from raids. And here's why. Firstly, in many places, it runs at the foot of nearby hills, as here, for example. It is obvious that the enemy, having climbed the neighboring peaks, could easily shoot all the defenders on this stretch of the wall. Chinese soldiers would have nowhere to hide from the arrows flying from above. Secondly, watchtowers were built every 60-100 meters along the entire length of the wall. Large military units were supposed to be constantly stationed in these towers and monitor for the appearance of the enemy. But already in the third century BC, during the reign of Emperor Shi Huang, when 4,000 kilometers of the wall had already been built, it was found out that if the towers were installed so often, it would be impossible to ensure an effective defense of the wall. All the armed forces of the Chinese Empire would not be sufficient. And if a small detachment is put on each tower, it will become easy prey for the enemy. A small detachment will be eliminated before neighboring units can come to its aid. If defensive units are made larger but installed less frequently, then unprotected sections of the wall that are too long will be formed, through which the enemy will easily penetrate deep into the country. It is not surprising that the construction of such a fortification did not protect China from raids. However, its construction greatly depleted the state, and the Qin dynasty lost the throne. The new Han dynasty was not counting on the Great Wall and returned to a system of maneuver warfare. But still, as historians claim, the construction of the wall continued for some reason. A strange story. An interesting fact is that until the end of the 17th century, besides the Great Wall, no large stone structures had been built in China. And yet, scholars claim that the population of China engaged in constant civil wars. Why didn't they fortify themselves with walls or build stone citadels in their cities? With such unique experience in building the Great Wall, the entire country could have been covered with defensive structures. It turns out that all of China's resources, efforts, and talents were spent only on building the Great Wall, which was, in general, useless from a military point of view. But there is another historical version of the construction of the Great Wall of China. This version is not as popular among historians as the first one, but it is more logical. The Great Wall was indeed built along the border of China, but not for protection from nomads, but as a demarcation line between two states. And its construction began not two thousand years ago, but much later, in the 17th century AD, so the famous wall is no more than three hundred years old. An interesting historical fact supports this

version. According to the official historical version, by the mid-17th century, the northern lands of China, that is, those lands bordering Russia were severely depopulated. To protect these territories from settlement by Russians, Mongols, and Koreans, in 1678, Emperor Kangxi ordered this border of the empire to be surrounded by a special fortified line. Its construction continued until the end of the 1680s. One might ask why the emperor needed to build a new fortified line if there was already a huge stone wall along the entire northern border of China. Most likely, there was no such wall there yet. Therefore, to protect their lands, the Chinese began building a line of fortifications. After all, it was during this time that China was engaged in border wars with Russia. And only at the end of the 17th century did the Russians and the Chinese agree on where the border between the two states would be. In 1689, the Russo-Chinese Treaty was signed in Nerchinsk, which fixed the northern border of China. Presumably, the Chinese rulers of the 17th century attached great importance to the Treaty of Nerchinsk. Therefore, they decided to mark the border not only on paper but also on the ground. Thus a border wall appeared along the entire border with Russia. This is an 18th-century map of Asia made by the Royal Academy in Amsterdam. Here, two states, China and Tartary, are clearly visible. The northern border of China runs approximately along the 40th parallel. The Great Wall of China also runs precisely along the border. Moreover, it is marked with a bold line and the inscription, Muraille de la Chine, which means the wall of China in French. The same can be seen on the map of Asia issued in 1754. Here, the Great Wall also runs approximately along the border between China and Tartary. The wall is also depicted on the map of Tartary by Guillaume Delisle. It is clearly visible that this is not just a bold line, but a wall with towers. And this is a large Gottorp globe that is stored in the Kunstkamera in St. Petersburg. It also clearly shows an image of the wall, which marks the border between China and the neighboring state of Chinese Tartary. Overall, this is a unique case in cartography where an architectural structure is depicted on a geographical map. Certainly, one could assume that ancient Chinese people as early as two thousand years ago predicted where the Russo-Chinese border would be located. And in 1689, without any trickery, the two countries simply established the border along the already-existing wall. But if that were the case, it would have been mentioned in the Treaty. However, there is no mention of the wall in the Treaty of Nerchinsk. For several decades, scientists around the world have been ringing the alarm bell. One of the Seven Wonders of the World, the Great Wall of China, is rapidly deteriorating. Indeed, in some places, the height of the wall has decreased to two meters. Watchtowers have completely disappeared in some areas. Several tens of kilometers of the wall have been completely lost, and hundreds of kilometers continue to rapidly deteriorate. And this is despite the fact that over the past few centuries, the wall has been repeatedly repaired and restored. So why wasn’t it collapsing at such a fast pace before? Why, after standing for over two thousand years, is it suddenly turning into ruins? Scientists blame the climate, ecology, agriculture, and, for sure, tourists. Every year, ten million people visit the wall, climbing where they can and cannot. They want to see even the sections of the wall that are closed to visitors. But the reason for its deterioration is probably different. The Great Wall of China is deteriorating in a perfectly natural way, like all similar structures. Three hundred years is a very respectable age for a stone structure. And the idea that this great Chinese long-term construction project is two thousand years old is a myth, like much of China's own history. However, in ancient China, there likely was a fortification that was called a wall. Its fragments can still be found near the modern-day Great Wall of China. When I visited the Great Wall of China in early 2010, specifically the wall that is presented as the ancient Great Wall of China, I fortunately brought a strong pair of binoculars with me. And as I

surveyed the area in front of this wall, I saw that the Chinese wall really existed. It was visible through the binoculars. This wall does not run along mountain peaks like the fake wall that is shown to tourists, which I walked on. It was clear to me that I was walking on a fake wall. But the wall that I saw through the binoculars left an impression of being a truly ancient, old wall. Unfortunately, this wall is almost completely destroyed. However, in photographs taken by Gleb Nosovsky, it is clear that it runs along a plain. It can be seen that the wall was not made of stone, but of rammed earth. Judging by the fragments of towers that have survived on the wall, it truly had a military, frontier purpose. But despite the fact that this ancient structure is located quite close to the modern wall, Chinese historians pretend that the ancient fortification simply does not exist. Several graduate students, historians from Peking University, accompanied me. When I showed them this wall through binoculars, they just exclaimed and gestured, they had never heard of it before. I asked them if it was possible to go there, to this wall. I received a clear and confident answer: no, it's not possible. Myths about the past of peoples and the authenticity of historical monuments arose in times when people had a very vague idea even about life in neighboring cities, let alone distant countries and continents. Therefore, any tall tale told by a passing traveler was taken at face value by people. Today we have access to a huge amount of historical information. We have the opportunity to see the world and verify the truthfulness of this information. Therefore, while inspecting ancient cities and modern museums, climbing ruins and descending into tombs, we must look at the world with our own eyes, not just through the eyes of tour guides. After all, the more carefully we treat history, the less room there will be for fabrication and forgery. The results of the scientific project New Chronology allow us to speak about the fact that Russian history has suffered the most from the activities of falsifiers. Unlike other states, Russia's past was distorted beyond recognition. By order of the reformers of the 17th and 18th centuries, many historical facts were completely rewritten, and some even disappeared from the pages of Russian history. One of the vivid examples of historical falsification is the era of the 16th century. Historians not only invented a new interpretation of the political events of that time, but also completely distorted the biographies of the rulers of the Rurik dynasty. See our next part Ivan the Terrible, to learn who really ruled under the name of Ivan IV.

## Ivan the Terrible

On January 16, 1547, a solemn coronation of Grand Prince Ivan Vasilyevich took place in the Moscow Kremlin Assumption Cathedral. He was later known as Ivan the Terrible. The textbook history of this tsar's reign is known to almost everyone, but not everyone pays attention to a number of very strange circumstances that are contained in the biography of Ivan the Terrible. So far, none of the historians have given them a reasonable explanation. Usually, all the strange and unusually cruel actions of the Russian autocrat are explained by his pathological cruelty and mental illness. In this part, we will try to find out if this was really the case. Every researcher of the era of Ivan the Terrible is faced with the fact that almost no authentic documents have survived from this time. The archives of the Oprichnina, which contained the court cases of that period, were completely destroyed. It is no secret that the preservation of Russian archives and libraries of the 16th century is the worst in all of Europe. In many documents from the middle and end of the 16th century, one

can see obvious traces of later tendentious editing. For example, the Regal Book, which is part of the Illustrated Chronicle of Ivan the Terrible, contains many errors and insertions of a polemical or journalistic nature. Most of Ivan the Terrible's own works have been preserved as a 17th-18th century version, that is, the time of the Romanovs. There are only seven documents of Ivan the Terrible that can be considered authentic. These are a letter to Vasily Griazny, a message to Simeon Bekbulatovich, Stefan Batory, Sigismund II Augustus, Grigory Khatkevich, Queen Elizabeth I of England, and a manuscript of the dispute over faith between Ivan the Terrible and Jan Rokita. And that's it. There is no famous decree on the Oprichnina, no obituary supposedly written by Ivan the Terrible after repentance. Not even the genuine last testament of Ivan the Terrible has been preserved. It is interesting that the supposedly authentic last testaments of other Moscow princes have been preserved. For example, three testaments of Vasily I Dmitryevich written 150 years before Ivan the Terrible. Even the supposedly genuine testament of Ivan Kalita, which is 250 years older than Ivan the Terrible's documents, has been preserved. But there is no genuine will of Ivan Vasilyevich. The last testament of Ivan the Terrible has been preserved in a single damaged copy and without a date. The same is true for charters. Forty charters of Ivan III, the grandfather of Ivan the Terrible, have survived, but not a single authentic charter with Ivan IV's seal, although historians claim otherwise. But to prove this, often blatant forgeries are cited instead of authentic documents. Historians call this document the Charter of Ivan IV. An authentic document should have an authentic seal. At that time, the seal was placed as follows: first, several holes were made under the signature, through which a cord was passed. The ends of the cord were twisted and fastened, usually with a wax or lead seal. All this was done to prevent the seal from being transferred to another document without damaging the seal itself or the paper to which it was attached. So what do we see on the alleged Charter of Ivan the Terrible? It is quite obvious that the seal, along with the cord and part of the paper, was cut out from some other document and attached to this charter. Historians call this obvious forgery an authentic document. But if virtually no authentic documents of Ivan the Terrible have survived, then what is the traditional history of his life and reign based on? From what sources did historians assemble information about him? When a thoughtful researcher of history asks this question, it turns out that everything we know about the era of Ivan the Terrible is mostly a myth, not real historical facts. The creators of this myth were, for example, some contemporaries of Ivan the Terrible who had weighty reasons to hate the Tsar and slander him. First and foremost, these were some Western Europeans and Prince Kurbsky, who betrayed the Tsar and his homeland and fled to Europe. In particular, evidence of the cruelty of Ivan IV is based on their writings. The reliability of these writings is very doubtful, and one cannot rely on them as a serious source. It is believed that Kurbsky was a direct descendant of Rurik and Prince Vladimir through the senior line, while Ivan the Terrible was of the junior line. It's understandable that with such a lineage, Kurbsky was a contender for the Russian throne, but he only received the Grand Principality of Yaroslavl. It's not surprising that Kurbsky felt anger, envy, and resentment towards Ivan the Terrible throughout his life. The stories written by Kurbsky and other Western European opponents of Ivan Vasilyevich remained just stories for a long time. These stories became historical facts, allegedly truthful and authentic, on the pages of the historical works of the official historiographer of the Russian Empire, Nikolay Karamzin. While writing the official version of Russian history upon the order of the ruling Romanov family, Karamzin paid special attention to the era of Ivan the Terrible. In June 1814, in one of his letters to Alexander Turgenev, he wrote: Without a chapter about Ivan the Terrible, my story will be like a peacock without a tail. And Karamzin painted this very tail with the darkest

colors. It was in his multi-volume work titled History of the Russian State that the era of Ivan the Terrible appeared as a dark Middle Ages and a shameful stain on Russian history. Thanks to Karamzin's efforts, the image of Ivan the Terrible as a bloody monster prevailed. And it's not surprising. As the famous Russian historian Nikolay Dmitrievich Talberg wrote, Karamzin literally hated the Terrible Tsar. At the same time, Karamzin bowed before Western European tyrants, some of whom he met during his travels in Europe. For example, he admired Napoleon, and Robespierre evoked reverence in him. Many serious researchers of Karamzin's history argued that it was more of an artistic interpretation of events than an impartial historical analysis. And yet, this artistic interpretation became the official version of Russian history. It should be said that the nickname the Terrible, which historians have been exploiting for centuries, was given to Ivan Vasilyevich by his contemporaries not for his cruelty towards his subjects, but for the fear he instilled in Russia's enemies. Moreover, this was not the first case in Russian history. For example, Ivan IV's grandfather, also named Ivan Vasilyevich, was also called the Terrible. And the prince of Tver, Dmitry Mikhailovich, whom his enemies called Dmitry the Fearsome Eyes. However, today we adhere to the historical version that was once invented by foreigners. That is, we look at our past through the eyes of former and current enemies of Russia. When historians write about the so-called unprecedented cruelty of Ivan the Terrible, it is unclear how they reconcile this with historical facts. From the surviving documents, it is known that during the 50 years of Ivan's reign; no more than five thousand people were sentenced to death. The vast majority of those executed are named in the documents. These people were guilty not of mythical, but very real conspiracies, treasons, and other crimes. At the same time, so-called enlightened European monarchies were exterminating their subjects by tens of thousands for lesser crimes. For example, in England in the first half of the 16th century, 70,000 people were hanged for vagrancy alone. And in Germany, in 1525, during the suppression of the peasant uprising, German authorities killed 100,000 people. Few people know that in the era of Ivan the Terrible, only six particularly serious crimes were punishable by death. Murder, rape, sodomy, arson of a residential building with people inside, robbery of a temple, and state treason. And during the reign of the Romanovs, this figure increased by tens of times. For example, under Alexei Mikhailovich Romanov, capital punishment was already imposed for 80 types of crimes, and under Peter the Great, as many as 120. However, despite these facts, historians to this day continue to reinforce the myths about Ivan the Terrible, invented by Kurbsky and his like-minded people. There are many scholarly works dedicated to the era of Ivan IV, but these writings, like the works of Karamzin, should be considered more as literary works than serious factual research. Not only the documents of Ivan the Terrible, but virtually none of his personal belongings has survived to our time. Today, only a few items can confidently be considered as personal belongings of Ivan Vasilyevich. One of them is the Throne of the Terrible, completely covered with carved plates made of ivory. An exact copy of the throne is kept in the museum-reserve Alexandrovskaya Sloboda. It is believed that the throne was made in Europe specifically for Ivan IV, and then brought to Moscow. In 2006, Russian scientists Anatoly Fomenko and Gleb Nosovsky studied the images on the carved plates covering the royal chair and discovered among them a zodiac with a horoscope. Today, many people mistakenly believe that horoscopes are solely related to astrology, fortune-telling by the stars, predicting fate, and other similar activities, far from science. But in fact, this is not the case. In the Middle Ages, horoscopes were used to record dates. These images show the placement of planets in the constellations of the celestial zodiac at a particular moment in time. For example, it is known that behind the altars of medieval German

churches, special zodiacal clocks were sometimes installed. On these clocks, every day the positions of the planets in the constellations were displayed for citizens to observe. Fomenko and Nosovsky suggested that since a horoscope was placed on the throne of the Russian tsar, then the date encrypted in the horoscope must have a direct relation to him. After deciphering the horoscope using our methods for dating zodiacs, we discovered that the date of February 9, 1526 was recorded on the throne of Ivan the Terrible. At first glance, this does not fit with his standard biography. We know from official history that the dates of Ivan's life are 1530-1584. However, we also know that in Western Europe, where it is believed the throne was specifically made for Ivan, the birthdays of monarchs were typically recorded using horoscopes. Therefore, it is natural to assume that in this case, the date recorded on Ivan's throne is his date of birth. It turns out that the great Tsar Ivan Vasilyevich the Terrible was born on February 9, 1526. But the official date of Ivan Vasilyevich's birth is 1530, which is indicated in many chronicles. Could the ancient chroniclers have made such a mistake and all at once? After all, the birth of the heir to the throne, the long-awaited son of Vasily III, was a significant event and was celebrated throughout the country. Most likely, these chronicles, like most documents from the time of Ivan the Terrible, were edited during the time of the Romanovs. However, if Ivan the Terrible was indeed born on February 9, 1526, this explains some of the oddities in his widely accepted biography. For example, chronicles report that in November 1530, Grand Prince Vasily III and Grand Princess Elena, along with their son, Prince Ivan, were present at the consecration of the Church of St. Paraskeva Friday. According to the official version, Ivan was only three months old at the time. But the consecration of the church is a lengthy ritual that is performed in the presence of a large crowd. Could the Grand Prince have risked his only heir like that? However, if the Prince was born in 1526, then he would have already been four years old at that time. It is not surprising that his parents took him with them. After all, four years old is the beginning of a child's conscious age, when their worldview begins to form. The hypothesis of Fomenko and Nosovsky about the correct date of Ivan the Terrible's birth can be verified using Orthodox saints. It is known that in Russia, when a child was baptized, they were given not a random name, but the name of a saint whose memorial day was close to the infant's birthday. And until the end of the 16th century, Moscow rulers had both baptismal and royal names. For example, Ivan III's baptismal name was Timofey, and Vasily III's was Gavriil. So what was Ivan IV's baptismal name? It is known that Ivan the Terrible was a writer and signed some of his works with the name Parfeny. Where did this name come from? It's a mystery. But now we can solve this mystery. The thing is, the name Parfeny perfectly corresponds to the calculated birthday we found, which is February 9th. The memorial day of St. Parfeny is only once a year on February 7th after the Julian calendar. The difference between February 9th and February 7th is only two days. Therefore, it is likely that Parfeny was the baptismal name of Ivan the Terrible. Skeptics may argue, what difference does it make when Ivan the Terrible was born, in 1530 or four years earlier? What does it change? This should change our attitude towards the version of Russian history in the 16th century that historians defend. If they were wrong even in such a simple but important dating as the date of Ivan the Terrible's birth, then they can hardly be unquestionably trusted. The decryption of the zodiac on the royal throne is not the only result of the research into the era of Ivan the Terrible conducted by Anatoly Fomenko and Gleb Nosovsky. The study of this period in Russian history occupies a special place in their research work. They have noted that the traditional biography of the Russian autocrat contains a large number of anomalies and contradictions. According to official history, throughout his life, Ivan Vasilyevich committed acts that went against not only common

sense but also the centuries-old tradition of the Orthodox state. When studying the different periods of Ivan the Terrible's rule, one gets the impression that for 50 years, not the same person but completely different people were on the Russian throne, their actions were so contradictory and inconsistent. Nothing like this has ever happened before in Russian or world history. In January 1565, Ivan the Terrible left Moscow voluntarily with his family and entourage and abdicated the throne. According to traditional history, the boyar council did not accept the abdication and begged the Father the Tsar to return and rule as he saw fit. The tsar returned, but ten years later in 1575, he abdicated again and instead raised Simeon Bekbulatovich to the throne. As usual, Simeon's coronation as tsar took place in the Assumption Cathedral of the Kremlin. However, he only reigned as tsar for 11 months because in 1576, Ivan Vasilyevich changed his mind again and returned to the throne. Thus, according to the traditional version of history, Ivan the Terrible abdicated twice and returned to the throne twice. Another very strange fact. It is well known that rulers are crowned only once and sworn in once. But supposedly, everything was different in the case of Ivan the Terrible. He was crowned tsar twice, in 1547 and 1572, and they swore allegiance to him as many as four times! Nothing like this has ever happened in Russian history. And the story of Ivan the Terrible's numerous wives is completely unthinkable for a Christian state of the 16th century. As is well known, according to the laws of the Orthodox Church, a person can enter into marriage no more than three times. If God takes away the first, second, and third spouse, then one must remain a widower for the rest of one's life. But even a third marriage is allowed by the church as the utmost indulgence. However, as historians write, the Orthodox Tsar Ivan the Terrible scorned the laws of the Russian Church and married as many as seven times, not at all caring that children born in unlawful marriages would not have a legitimate right to the throne. Historians generally explain all these strange actions of the Russian tsar as a severe mental illness of Ivan IV. In this part, however, we will consider another version proposed by Anatoly Fomenko and Gleb Nosovsky. Our research has shown that Ivan the Terrible is not one specific person, but a collective image of four successive rulers who ruled one after another on the Russian throne. Later, when the Romanovs created their version of ancient Russian history, they combined all four under one collective name of Ivan the Terrible. This version of the authors of the New Chronology may seem paradoxical only at a first glance. When carefully studying this historical period, it is simply impossible not to see that the well-known image of Ivan the Terrible combines four different tsars. The first Tsar of the era of Ivan the Terrible was Ivan Vasilyevich the 4th himself. His reign lasted no more than six years, from 1547 to 1553. On January 16, 1547, Ivan IV was crowned as Tsar. Just a month later, on February 13, his wedding took place with Anastasia Romanova, the daughter of the courtier Roman Zakharyin, the progenitor of the future Romanov Tsars. From that moment, the Zakharyins sought not only to secure a strong position at court but also to exert significant influence on the internal and external policies of the state. However, in 1547, a court political party was formed around the young Tsar, led by the Proto-priest of the Annunciation Cathedral, Sylvester, and Aleksei Fedorovich Adashev. In letters of Prince Kurbsky, this party was called the Chosen Council or a circle of newly emerged royal advisers. Adashev was by the Tsar's side during the famous Kazan campaigns, including in 1552, when the most significant event of Ivan IV's reign took place, the capture of Kazan by Russian troops. For many years this victory was for the Russian people a sacred symbol of the defense of Russia and Orthodoxy. The special position of Sylvester and Adashev at Ivan Vasilyevich's court caused them to have many enemies, and the main ones were the Zakharyins, the relatives of Tsarina Anastasia. This enmity was particularly evident in 1553, during the severe

illness of Tsar Ivan. Sensing his imminent death, he ordered the boyars to swear allegiance to his only son, Prince Dmitry, and appoint a council of guardians since the Russian throne heir was only five months old. Kiss the cross for my son Dmitry! And at that moment discontent began among the boyars. The highest nobility, the noble boyars, understood that in the event of the tsar's death, power would most likely end up in the hands of the Zakharyins, who would become the de facto regents for the young tsar. They were more willing to swear allegiance to the tsar's cousin, Vladimir Staritsky, just to prevent the Zakharyins from coming to power. To share power with the boyars, to execute the will of the boyars! As a result of this clash, the tsarina's relatives were eventually pushed away from the throne, and the guardianship council was led by Aleksei Adashev. Despite his serious illness, Ivan IV recovered, but he could no longer govern the state. After his serious illness, Ivan the Terrible completely withdrew from affairs and became a holy fool. In winter and summer he could appear on the street in rags and chains. Today, perhaps, it would seem strange that a king appears in such a state and becomes a holy fool. However, in those times, holy fools were regarded with great respect, and the transformation of the tsar into a holy fool made a deep impression on his contemporaries. Moreover, even before his illness, the tsar showed great piety. For example, English visitors to Moscow at that time were amazed by the habits of the Russian ruler. They noted that he shunned coarse pleasures, did not like hunting, but found pleasure in worship. Apparently, the great Tsar Ivan Vasilyevich the Terrible and the famous Holy Fool Basil the Blessed are actually the same person. By the way, the name Basil or Vasily simply means king, or basileus in Greek. In 1557, the Blessed Tsar died. His death was noted in the official records of the Razryadny Prikaz, i.e., administrative office in charge of higher military and civil administration personnel. It is known that Basil the Blessed was buried with a huge gathering of people. And it's not surprising. They buried not just a Holy Fool, but a former king. Basil was buried in one of the domes of the Pokrovsky Cathedral. Despite the fact that each of the nine domes of the Pokrovsky Cathedral has its own separate name, people still call it the Saint Basil's Cathedral. By the way, the calendar of saints mentions not only Basil the Blessed, but also Ivan the Blessed, the Moscow miracle worker, about whom almost no details are known. It is believed that he died in Moscow and his body was also buried with great honor in the Pokrovsky Cathedral. Most likely, we are talking about the same person: Tsar Ivan IV, who was buried precisely in the Pokrovsky Cathedral, which was built in honor of the conquest of Kazan. So Ivan IV could have been twice included in the calendar of saints, under the name Ivan and under the name Basil. The most reliable and earliest surviving image of Ivan IV the Terrible is considered to be the Copenhagen portrait, which is kept in the National Museum of Denmark in Copenhagen. Interestingly, this portrait is painted like an icon with egg tempera on boards and in a pure icon-painting style. The edges of the board protrude outward, and the image is placed in a recess, which is called an ark. An ark was typically made only on icons. It was not easy to cut such a rectangular recess in the boards and then level it. This was done in accordance with special church requirements. All old Russian icons were made in this style. On modern icons, the ark is usually not made anymore. Historians prefer to call this portrait a parsuna rather than an icon. A parsuna is a transitional style from icon painting to secular portraiture. Obviously, historians cannot acknowledge that the Copenhagen portrait is a true Russian icon. After all, they would have to either explain why the tyrant and polygamist was canonized as a saint or admit that the official biography of Ivan the Terrible is incorrect. But the existence of this portrait only confirms the version of Fomenko and Nosovsky, that Ivan IV was indeed a blessed one, canonized by the Orthodox Church. In October 1552, Tsar Ivan IV and Tsarina Anastasia gave

birth to their first child, Grand Prince Dmitri. This happened five months before Ivan the Terrible fell seriously ill. Historians believe that Dmitri drowned a year after his birth, allegedly due to the negligence of his nanny, who accidentally dropped the child into the water. However, the authors of the New Chronology have proposed a different version. The little Prince Dmitri did not die in 1553 at all. He lived for about ten more years. During this time, the Chosen Council ruled on behalf of the underage prince. At its head were Adashev and Sylvester. Official history states that from 1553 to 1560, Adashev constantly lived in Moscow, accompanying the sovereign everywhere, including in military campaigns. Historians explain this by the close friendship between Adashev and Tsar Ivan IV. But such behavior by the leader of the court party is more like guardianship than friendship. Most likely, we are not talking about Ivan IV, but about the underage Tsar Dmitri. Adashev was always next to him. He rarely left Moscow because at that time he was the de facto ruler of the state. The child-king, of course, did not participate in military campaigns. But all wars were fought on behalf of the Tsar, so Adashev's presence in the army was equivalent to the arrival of the sovereign. Another fact suggests that Adashev performed royal functions for the underage Tsar Dmitry. In those years, the first Prikazes were created in Russia, institutions that managed separate branches of state life. However, they were initially called izba that is house, rather than Prikaz. Adashev was in charge of the supreme control body, the petition izba. This institution accepted petitions addressed to the Tsar and conducted investigations on his behalf. Adashev personally participated in making decisions on each case. This would have been entirely natural if the throne were occupied by a child Tsar. But it is entirely unclear why Adashev had such concentrated power in his hands if Ivan IV was still on the throne. Some historians believe that Ivan himself withdrew from state affairs, while others claim that Adashev and Sylvester simply usurped power in the country. It is likely that this would have been possible in the case of a weak or incapacitated ruler. However, in traditional history, Ivan the Terrible appears in a completely different light, as a powerful and active person. It is difficult to imagine that he could have remained an indifferent observer of someone else's activities. This contradicted his nature entirely. It is known that Tsar Ivan IV, even when he was very young, personally dealt with matters in which his participation was not necessary at all. For example, at the age of 17, he himself resolved a complicated dispute between boyar Ivan Sheremetev and the princes of Zvenigorod. And governing the state is a far more serious matter than a boyar's dispute. During the reign of Dmitri Ivanovich and the actual rule of the Chosen Council, the Russians won a victory over the Astrakhan Khanate in 1557. And in 1558, they began a war with Livonia. However, in 1563, Prince Dmitri died. In the later Romanov version of history, the death of Prince Dmitri was attributed to the year 1591, during the reign of Boris Godunov. This is the well-known story of his death in Uglich, where he was supposedly murdered. As a result, it was believed that Ivan the Terrible had two little sons; both named Dmitri, who died due to the negligence of their nannies. However, this is not true. In reality, Ivan the Terrible had only one son named Dmitri. After Dmitri's death in 1563, serious changes began to take place in the country. After the death of prince Dmitry in 1563, Ivan, the younger son of Ivan IV and Anastasia, became the Russian Tsar. At that time he was about ten years old. While Dmitri was being raised by his guardians, led by Adashev, Ivan was surrounded by his mother's relatives, the Zakharyin-Romanovs. Therefore, after Dmitri's death and Ivan's ascension, there was not just a change of ruler, but a virtual coup d'état took place in the country. The power entirely fell into the hands of the Zakharyins. The Chosen Council was removed from the throne. Sylvester was forced into monkhood and sent to Kirillo-Belozersky Monastery and then further to Solovki. The Adashev

brothers were sent to the Livonian War. But in October 1560, Alexei Adashev's properties were signed over to the sovereign, practically in favor of the Zakharyins, and he was imprisoned. The Zakharyins launched a ruthless manhunt, resulting in the extermination of all the Adashevs and their closest relatives. The Zakharyins did not spare even the children of the Adashev clan. There is a testimony that Anna, the daughter of Alexei Fyodorovich, who was married to Ivan Petrovich Golovin, survived the pogrom. But these rumors were not documented. Alexei Fyodorovich himself escaped execution, but shocked and outraged, he soon fell ill and died in Dorpat in early 1561. The famous era of the Oprichnina began after the defeat of the Chosen Council. The Oprichnina was officially established in 1564. The main initiator of its creation was boyar Vasily Yuryev-Zakharyin. It was around the Zakharyin clan that the ruling circle of the Oprichnina, a bloody terror that historians later attributed to Tsar Ivan IV, was grouped. The Oprichnina was not terror unleashed by Ivan the Terrible against his own people. No, it was terror unleashed by the Zakharyin-Romanov boyars against their opponents. Taking advantage of the fact that they became guardians of the young tsar, the Zakharyin-Romanovs began to destroy the old Russian nobility, since all the old Russian nobility belonged to their opponents. To put it in modern terms, the Romanovs were pro-Western people, expressing the interests of the West. And their opponents were people who fought for their homeland, for Russia. And the Oprichnina they unleashed was essentially the beginning of a civil war that engulfed Russia at that time and the beginning of the Time of Troubles, which eventually led to the destruction of the old Russian dynasty and the collapse of the Great medieval Russian Empire. Starting in 1563, intensive work began in Moscow on writing Russian history, or rather rewriting it. Even official history does not deny this. The heyday of Moscow chronicles falls on the 1560s and ends in 1568. Even before fully seizing the throne, the Zakharyin-Romanovs began to compose their own version of Russian history. Interestingly, the fate of the commissioned people who led the compilation of the chronicles was tragic. After the work was completed, many of them were executed. Both the Zakharyin-Romanovs themselves and those who supported them were mostly lowborn nobles striving for power. Therefore, their main goal was the complete eradication of the Rurik dynasty. The murder of the representative of the royal family, Vladimir Staritsky, and the mass executions of noble boyars exhausted all the patience of the military. In 1571, Moscow was taken by the enemies of the Romanovs. To conceal the true history of those events, Romanov historians depicted it as an invasion by the Crimean Khan. After the capital was taken, the famous Moscow affair began. It was during this period that Malyuta Skuratov, a devoted supporter of the national party, carried out his activities. Later, the Romanovs tendentiously portrayed him as a bloody executioner. Malyuta Skuratov was indeed forced to act extremely harshly. But his actions were aimed at defeating the Zakharyin group and their supporters. Thus, the first attempt by the Zakharyin-Romanovs to seize the Russian throne failed. And in 1572, a royal decree was issued prohibiting even the use of the word Oprichnina. In the same year, the third Tsar of the era of Ivan the Terrible, Ivan Ivanovich, was removed from power. According to traditional history, in 1575, it is alleged that Ivan the Terrible abdicated for the second time and placed Tatar prince Simeon Bekbulatovich on the throne. It is believed that before converting to Orthodoxy, he was called Sain-Bulat Khan and that during the reign of Ivan the Terrible, he and his father, Sultan Bek-Bulat, joined the service of the Russian Tsar, converted to Christianity, and received the name Simeon. After Simeon's coronation, Tsar Ivan the Terrible allegedly began to travel around Moscow like an ordinary boyar, in shaft horse, and moved to Petrovka street. When he came to the Kremlin Palace, he sat on the side of the throne, where Simeon now sat, listening humbly to his orders. It is

believed that all of this was just a prank, and that Ivan the Terrible remained the real ruler. Simeon only spent 11 months on the throne, and then Ivan the Terrible allegedly decided to end this performance and returned to the throne, sending Simeon Bekbulatovich to the Grand Principality of Tver. Historians cannot explain why Ivan the Terrible replaced himself with a man who was not of royal blood but a baptized Tatar, let alone the fact that they do not have even one reasonable explanation for why the Terrible did this at all. This action of the tsar resembles the behavior of a madman or schizophrenic, as Romanov historians persistently portray him. However, the surviving documents speak not of a joke but of a completely real ascent to the throne of a man who had royal origins. Simeon was a true tsar. He was the fourth tsar of the era of Ivan the Terrible. By the way, he ruled not for just one year, as is commonly believed, but for significantly longer. In 1572, young Ivan Ivanovich was effectively deprived of power. Three years later, in 1575, he was forced to formally abdicate in favor of the new tsar, Simeon. Thus, a tsar of the Horde dynasty ascended to the throne. This was by no means some alien Tatar khan, but a genuine Russian tsar of the Rurik dynasty. Therefore, Simeon ascended to the throne after the defeat of the Romanov-Zakharyin clan. Simeon was most likely the son of Ivan III, and his name was originally Simeon. Upon ascending the throne, he received a new name Ivan. It should be noted that for a long period in Russian history, tsars had names Vasily or Ivan. Vasily simply meant tsar or basileus in Greek. It is believed that Ivan III's son Simeon Ivanovich, the Grand Prince of Kaluga, died suddenly in 1518 at the age of 30. Strangely, the circumstances of his death are practically unknown. Most likely, written sources describing the life of Simeon Ivanovich, like most documents of that time, were edited during the Romanov era and cannot be fully trusted. Fomenko and Nosovsky believe that Simeon Ivanovich did not die in 1518, but lived to a ripe old age. By 1572, he would have been around 80 years old, which coincides with the description of Ivan the Terrible of that time. In the surviving documents, he appears before us as a completely frail old man. Even if historians were mistaken about Ivan IV's date of birth and he was actually born 4 years earlier than the accepted date, he would have been no more than 50 years old in 1575. Despite historians explaining Ivan the Terrible's early frailty as a result of his mental illness, it is more likely that these documents refer to the elderly Simeon Ivanovich instead of Ivan IV. Tsar Simeon-Ivan died in 1584, and the throne passed to his son Fyodor Ivanovich. According to the authors of the New Chronology, Anatoly Fomenko and Gleb Nosovsky, the era of Ivan the Terrible should be divided into periods of the reign of four tsars. From 1547 to 1553, Ivan IV ruled directly. From 1553 to 1563, his minor son Dmitri Ivanovich sat on the throne. From 1563 to 1572, Ivan IV's other son, Ivan Ivanovich, was the tsar. And finally, from 1572 to 1584, Simeon Ivanovich, the uncle of Tsar Ivan Vasilyevich the 4th, was on the Russian throne. However, for the boyars of the Romanovs, who seized the throne in the 17th century, it was necessary for only one of the four tsars, Ivan IV, to remain in history. This is because after the death of Tsar Ivan Ivanovich and the ascension of Simeon Ivanovich to the throne, two dynastic branches emerged. The first is the descendants of Ivan IV and Anastasia Romanova, raised by the Zakharyin-Romanovs. The second branch is the descendants of Simeon Ivanovich, that is, his son Fyodor Ivanovich, then the son of Fyodor, known as Boris Godunov, and his children. For the Romanovs, the second branch was not only unnecessary, but also dangerous. Therefore, Romanov historians later invented tales about foreigners on the Russian throne, the Tatar prince Simeon Bekbulatovich and the lowborn boyar Godunov. It was necessary for the Romanovs that the information in Russian history only remained about the branch descending from Ivan IV and his wife Anastasia Romanova, because the relationship with Anastasia somehow justified their

claims to the Russian throne. The era of Ivan the Terrible is not just one of the periods of our history. It is the time of the flourishing of the Russian Empire, the time of the triumph of Russian weapons and Orthodox faith. It was during this era that Russia reached its highest level of development and power. And the great Russian tsar Ivan the Terrible was a symbol of the people in the struggle against external and internal enemies. However, for two hundred years, historians, starting with Karamzin, have spun a web of lies around the name of the great Russian tsar. And not just historians. Writers and filmmakers also engage in the propagation of this false myth. But despite the abundance of falsehoods about Ivan the Terrible that have been concocted over the past two centuries, our society is once again beginning to show an interest in the true facts of his life and is analyzing the results of his rule. Today, many already understand that any historical version must be based on serious scientific research, not on the fantasies of historians and filmmakers. One of the darkest and most contradictory periods in Russian history is the reign of Boris Godunov and False Dmitry. Traditional history assures us that both were accidental people on the Russian throne. According to historians, first Godunov, and then False Dmitry, usurped power in the country without having any legitimate rights to the Moscow throne. To find out what really happened, read our next part, Time of Troubles.

## Time of Troubles, Boris Godunov, False Dmitry

In our previous part Ivan the Terrible, we talked about how after the ascension of the Romanov dynasty to the Russian throne, Russian history was completely rewritten. Not only was the interpretation of historical events in the second half of the 16th and early 17th centuries fundamentally changed, but also the biographies of the last tsars of the Rurik dynasty. Traditional history assures us that the Rurik dynasty ended with the death of childless Tsar Fyodor Ivanovich, and the absence of direct heirs became the reason for the cruel struggle for the throne. But it appears, this historical version is incorrect. In this part, we will tell you the true reason for those tragic events in Russian history that later became known as the Time of Troubles. Historians believe that the Time of Troubles began in 1598 after the death of Tsar Fyodor Ivanovich. Due to the absence of direct heirs, power in Russia was passed from hand to hand for 15 years. However, according to the authors of the New Chronology, Anatoly Fomenko and Gleb Nosovsky, the Time of Troubles in Russia began much earlier, in the time of Ivan the Terrible, that is, in the middle of the 16th century when power in the country temporarily fell into the hands of the Zakharyin-Romanov clan. For almost ten years, the Zakharyin-Romanovs dealt with their political opponents, chief amongst them, all members of the royal family. This period went down in history as the Time of Oprichnina. Despite their defeat, the Romanovs continued to fight for the throne, and fifty years later, the first Romanov ascended to the Russian throne. And the two last rulers of the Rurik dynasty, Boris Godunov and False Dmitry, were declared by the Romanovs as illegal rulers, impostors on the Russian throne, and all the troubles and crimes committed in Russia during the Time of Troubles were blamed on them. However, the documents and testimonies from that era tell a completely different story. So, who really were Tsar Boris Fyodorovich Godunov and False Dmitry the First? For centuries, historians have spoken of Boris Godunov as a random person at the pinnacle of Russian power. It is believed that it was his illegal rule that became the main cause of

turmoil in the state and allowed False Dmitry the First to triumphantly enter Moscow. But was Godunov's power really illegal? Let's turn to authentic historical facts. It is known that in 1591, during the reign of Tsar Fyodor Ivanovich, Boris Godunov received a letter from Crimean Khan Gazi Giray. This letter is usually called the letter of the Crimean Khan to Boyar Boris Godunov. However, the letter itself is written in Arabic and has a translation on the back. In this translation, a Moscow official wrote the following words: the letter is addressed to Tsar Boris Fyodorovich from a close person of the Crimean Khan, Akhmad Agha. Thus, even during the reign of Fyodor Ivanovich, letters addressed to Boris Fyodorovich were marked as letters to the Tsar. Therefore, I emphasize that the annotation on this letter was made right at the time the letter was accepted. It was not a later annotation, but a note made right at the time the letter was received, due to the fact that it was being translated from Arabic into Russian. This record sharply contradicts the Romanov version of Godunov's biography. It turns out that seven years before the death of Fyodor Ivanovich, in a genuine official document, Boris Godunov was called not a boyar, but a tsar. However, while the sovereign was alive, calling someone else a tsar could only be done if that person was his heir. Such was the custom of the Moscow tsars, to name their son the Grand Duke and Tsar even during the lifetime of the reigning monarch. This custom came to Russia from Byzantium. For example, when Boris Godunov's son Fyodor grew up, he too was called Tsar and Grand Duke. An example of this is the solemn inscription made in 1600 under the dome of the Ivan the Great Bell Tower in the Moscow Kremlin. By the dispensation of the Holy Trinity, by the order of the Great Sovereign Tsar and Grand Duke Boris Fyodorovich, autocrat of All Russia and his son, faithful Great Sovereign Prince Grand Duke Fyodor Borisovich of All Russia, this temple was completed and gilded in the second year of their reign. Here, Godunov's son Fyodor is called the Great Sovereign, just like his father. It turns out that Boris Godunov was not the brother-in-law of tsar Fyodor Ivanovich, but his son. The Gazi Giray’s letter is not the only indication of Boris Godunov's royal lineage. Unfortunately, after the Romanovs came to power, many documents confirming the nobility of the Godunov family were destroyed. But some evidence has survived. It is believed that the founder of the Godunov dynasty was the Tatar prince murza Chet. He came to Russia during the reign of Ivan Kalita and was baptized under the name Zachary. While on his way to the capital to serve the Tsar, Chet stopped in Kostroma, where he founded the Orthodox Ipatiev Monastery. Later, the monks of this monastery wrote the Tale of Chet. Today, this ancient Russian literary work is the only written source that talks about murza Chet. Historians consider this source to be unreliable. In their opinion, the monks of the lost in the Russian wilderness monastery allegedly deliberately composed a fairy tale about the genealogy of the Godunovs to historically substantiate the princely origin of Boris Fyodorovich. Today, historians cannot deny the existence of the Tale of Chet. However, since the history written by the monks contradicts the traditional historical version, they declare that this document is full of inconsistencies and therefore it does not deserve even a bit of credibility. But the authors of the New Chronology believe that the ancient Russian monks did not make anything up. There was a time when Kostroma, which is located very close to Yaroslavl, was the capital of the Great Russian Medieval Empire. The old Russian dynasty emerged from there. And the Godunovs traced their ancestry to a Kostroma boyar who served Ivan Kalita, who created the Great Russian Medieval Empire through a great conquest. Therefore, historians are wrong to criticize the Ipatiev chroniclers. They were absolutely right. However, historians prefer not the chronicle records, but conjectures that are not supported by any documents. For example, that Irina and Boris Godunov were children of some unknown landowner named Fyodor Ivanovich. Historians consider the list of

a thousand best servants of the sovereign as evidence of the obscurity and insignificance of the Godunov family. According to Ivan the Terrible's decree, dated October 1, 1550, the highest class of service people, a thousand best or chosen servants, was established in Russia. They were all brought from the provinces and endowed with landed estates in the Moscow region. These new Moscow nobles formed the upper layer of the service people, as we would say today, the state elite. However, neither Fyodor Ivanovich Godunov, the father of Boris and Irina, nor his brother Dmitry, are on this list. Based on this, historians conclude that the Godunovs' ancestors never had any relation to the Moscow court and were generally upstarts. However, for some reason, Fyodor Ivanovich chose to marry Irina, the daughter of an unknown landowner Godunov, rather than a girl from a noble family close to the throne. Another interesting fact is that Boris Godunov lived in the royal palace from early childhood, meaning he grew up at court. And Irina was raised in the royal wing from the age of seven. If their ancestors, the Godunovs, had no relation to the Russian nobility, it is entirely unclear why unknown children from a declining family were brought to Moscow and raised as noble boyars. Historians cannot explain this. In our opinion, Boris Godunov's ancestors were Russian tsars, not some lowborn, unknown landowners. Fyodor Ivanovich was Boris Godunov's father; so naturally, Boris could not be mentioned in the list of his own best servants. The royal chancery did not write nonsense. Later, when the Romanovs began to write their version of history, the authentic documents about the origin of the Godunovs and their dynasty were destroyed by the Romanovs and their historians. Historian Skrynnikov, recognized by his colleagues as a great expert of that era, in his book Boris Godunov describes the arrival in Moscow of the Austrian ambassador Niklas von Warkotsch, whom Boris Godunov invited to his court. Interestingly, the ceremony of meeting the ambassador was the spitting image of a royal audience. Guards stood in the courtyard from gate to gate. Boris's courtiers were dressed in gold embroidered dresses and gold chains. The Austrian ambassador kissed Godunov's hand and presented him with a personal message from the emperor. From this description it is evident that Godunov received envoys, that is, he clearly performed the functions of the Tsar. And this was done while the Tsar Fyodor Ivanovich was alive. Historians explain this by saying that Boris simply usurped power in the country. It is also believed that he appropriated a lot of titles that he used in his dealings with foreigners. And foreigners, in turn, allegedly deliberately called Godunov other people's exaggerated titles. But at home in Russia, he was referred to not as a Tsar, but much simpler, a ruler. Where did this strange title come from, which never appeared again in Russian history? Historians took it, for example, from the letters of Boris Godunov to the English diplomat Jerome Horsey, in which Godunov allegedly called himself the ruler of all Russia. Skrynnikov also cites this example in his book Boris Godunov. But most likely, the word ruler appeared due to an incorrect back translation from English to Russian of the usual Russian words: "by the will of God Sovereign of all Russia". By the way, the English Queen Elizabeth I in her letters to Godunov called him "beloved cousin". At that time, this is how sovereigns of different countries addressed each other in a kindred way. If Boris Fyodorovich was just some kind of ruler, the English queen would hardly have addressed him in this way. So, there were no mysterious rulers in Russia, only sovereigns and Tsars. And the strange position of ruler was most likely invented by Romanov historians to conceal the true biography of Boris Godunov. Historians claim that the supposedly childless Tsar Fyodor Ivanovich did not leave a will, and after his death, a fierce struggle for the throne broke out. However, the same historians write that according to the official version of those years, there existed a document in which Tsar Fyodor designated his wife Irina as his successor on the throne,

and for Boris to inherit the kingdom and his spirit. Therefore, Boris was indicated as the heir in the official document. Historians do not trust this version because it came from the Godunovs themselves. They also find incredible the oath that subjects were supposed to swear to the new ruler. From the point of view of traditional history, such an oath looks strange. The subjects were forced to swear allegiance to Patriarch Job, Queen Irina, ruler Boris, and his children. At that time, such an oath would have caused confusion among the subjects at best, and could have ended in rebellion because people only swore allegiance to the new tsar. What does some ruler Boris have to do with it, let alone his children? In our reconstruction, there is nothing strange here. The country swears allegiance to Tsar Boris, the son of the deceased Tsar Fyodor, and his children, that is, the royal children. That Boris Godunov did not just perform some royal functions under Tsar Fyodor Ivanovich, but was his legitimate heir, is evidenced by another fact. Historians believe that Boris Godunov's rise to power occurred even under Ivan IV the Terrible, who considered his son Fyodor completely incapable of governing the state, so before his death, Ivan the Terrible made a will in which Fyodor and his family were placed under the care of the members of the Boyars' Council whose names were listed in the will. For a long time, historians believed that Tsar Ivan placed Boris Godunov at the head of the council of guardians, but when examining the documents, it turned out that this was not the case. Boris Fyodorovich Godunov's name is not mentioned at all in the will. There is also nothing said in other official papers about what positions Boris Godunov held at the court. There is information about the high positions of Dmitry and Stepan Godunov, but nothing was said about Boris. All these peculiarities can be easily explained by our reconstruction. Boris Godunov did not hold any positions because he was the son of the tsar and the tsar's heir. Moreover, he was already considered the tsar, so naturally Boris Godunov did not hold any lower positions. There is another reason why Boris Godunov's name could not appear in official documents regarding important state decisions. Boris was too young. Being the son of Fyodor, he had not yet reached the age when the heir to the throne is involved in serious state issues. Although historians claim that Godunov was born in 1552, it is more likely that this date was invented by the Romanov chroniclers. If Boris Godunov was the son of Fyodor Ivanovich, then he could not have been born earlier than 1579. It was in this year that Fyodor married Irina Godunova. Therefore, when Godunov ascended the throne, he was not 47 years old, as historians claim, but significantly younger. This version is indirectly confirmed by the images of Boris Godunov that have survived to this day. In all portraits, he is depicted as a young man. Boris's age also explains his father Fyodor Ivanovich's will. Since Boris was still too young at the time of his father's death, tsar Fyodor bequeathed his throne to his wife Irina, who was to become the regent for the heir to the throne. But the kingdom was still left to Boris. Almost everyone knows the canonical story of how Boris Godunov was persuaded to accept the crown. It is well known, for example, from Pushkin's poem Boris Godunov. Supposedly, after the death of Tsar Fyodor Ivanovich, Boris pretended to have no interest in the affairs of state and even went to a monastery. But the people and the boyars begged him on their knees to become the tsar, and he stubbornly refused, saying that he had no right to the Russian throne. However, in the end, Godunov yielded to the people's pleas and agreed to become the tsar. This version, as we know, was invented by the Romanov historians. But there is another version based on foreign sources, written by eyewitnesses of those distant events. One of them was an Austrian named Michael Schill. In his notes, he didn't write a word about Boris refusing the throne. On the contrary, he accepted it as a matter of course. According to Schill, Godunov said that he would take on the management of the state, and the dukes and boyars would be his assistants.

Certainly, compared to the vivid picture invented by the Romanovs, the Austrian's testimony seems very banal. But if there really was no story of begging Boris to become tsar, why did the Romanov court historians feel the need to invent it? Most likely, to emphasize the supposedly illegal election of Boris to the throne. The authors of the New Chronology, Gleb Nosovsky and Anatoly Fomenko, believe that the Romanov historians deliberately distorted Boris Godunov's biography, depriving him of his rightful title and family name. One of the reasons is that during the reign of Tsar Boris Fyodorovich Godunov, the family of the Romanov boyars suffered serious persecution. The Romanov brothers were accused of the most serious state crime, attempting to assassinate the tsar. The punishment for such a crime could only be death. Boris hesitated for a long time, not knowing what to do. In the end, the tsar showed leniency towards the conspirators, and none of the Romanov brothers were executed. The eldest brother Fyodor was tonsured as a monk and was exiled to a northern monastery under the name Filaret. Alexander, Michael, and Vasily were sent into exile. The Romanov party in the boyar council was also destroyed. It is not surprising that after the Romanovs came to power, the court chroniclers spared no ink to describe Godunov's villainy and to present the Romanovs as martyrs. But this was the revenge of the Romanovs, and the main reason was different. In our previous part Ivan the Terrible, we told the story that according to the research of Anatoly Fomenko and Gleb Nosovsky, the Romanov historians deliberately merged the reigns of four Russian tsars of the 16th century under the name of one ruler: Tsar Ivan the Terrible. This deception was necessary for the Romanovs to justify their right to the Russian throne. But in reality, in the 16th century two dynastic branches were formed in the Rurik dynasty: the ruling branch and the branch that was removed from power. The direct descendants of Tsar Ivan IV the Terrible and his wife Anastasia Romanova belonged to the branch that was removed from power. Tsar Dmitri Ivanovich, who died at the age of ten, his younger brother Ivan Ivanovich, and his son Dmitry belonged to this branch. In 1572, Tsar Ivan Ivanovich was removed from power. He was replaced on the throne by another representative of the Rurik dynasty, Simeon. Thus, a new ruling dynastic branch appeared. The descendants of Tsar Simeon-Ivan belonged to this branch: tsar Fyodor Ivanovich, his son Boris Fyodorovich Godunov, and Godunov's children, Fyodor and Xenia. The Romanovs belonged to the branch that was removed from power. Their rights to the Russian throne were justified solely by their relationship with Ivan IV. Therefore, the Godunovs became a real obstacle for the Romanovs on their way to seizing the Russian throne. A conspiracy was organized against Tsar Boris, led not only by the Romanovs but also by the Shuiskys and Golitsyns, who also dreamed of the Monomakh's Cap, so Godunov was poisoned. Tsar Boris died on April 13, 1605. Here's how it is described in the documents. At one o'clock Godunov was in the council of boyars, the Boyar Duma, then, he had lunch and had barely got up from the table when he felt ill. Then blood gushed from his mouth and nose. Two hours later the tsar passed away. The next day, Moscow swore allegiance to Boris Godunov's 16-year-old son, Fyodor. But his reign was short-lived. The conspirators were already preparing popular unrest and the coronation of False Dmitry. On June 10, 1605, a frantic crowd led by the conspirators the Shuiskys, Golitsyns, and Romanovs, burst into the royal chambers of the Kremlin. The young Tsar and his mother were strangled and buried without any honors. All relatives and supporters of the Godunovs were captured and executed. In December 1606, the remains of Boris Godunov, his wife-queen Maria, and son Fyodor were transferred to the Trinity Lavra of St. Sergius. In 1622, their daughter Xenia was buried there as well. Today, their tomb is located on the west side of the Assumption Cathedral of the Lavra. One of the members of this boyar conspiracy against the Godunovs was a man whom historians call

False Dmitry. Over the centuries, the Romanov historians have done everything possible to associate the cruel murder of the Tsar's family of Boris Godunov not with the Romanovs, but with False Dmitry the First, who was also called by these same historians the Pretender. But in reality, this is not the case. Probably, the prefix False appeared much later than the described events. Most likely, he was the real Prince Dmitry, but not the resurrected son of Ivan the Terrible who supposedly died in Uglich, but rather his grandson. The conspirators simply used Dmitry to clear the way to the Russian throne. Historians say that the personality of False Dmitry is an unresolved mystery of Russian history. Researchers of the Time of Troubles still do not understand why Dmitry was convinced of his royal origin from childhood. Why was he raised in the family of the boyars Romanovs, and then sent to a monastery where he was ordained as a deacon. And why did this unknown deacon first flee to Lithuania, and then dared to appear before the Polish king Sigismund and call himself a prince. And the king, instead of sending him away, on the contrary, allowed him to recruit an army and even gave him money for this. Evidently, all this is incomprehensible if one considers this man an impostor, as historians do. But most likely, they are mistaken. Official history claims that the real prince Dmitry was the youngest son of Ivan the Terrible and his last wife, Maria Nagaya. It is believed that he supposedly died in Uglich in 1591 at the age of ten. Both the grave of the boy and documents of the investigation into this case existed. But there is one very important fact. The investigation into the death of Prince Dmitry was carried out personally by Vasily Ivanovich Shuisky, who led a conspiracy against Boris Godunov. Even historians admit that the documents in this case were most likely falsified. At a cursory glance, there are obvious signs of hasty processing. The pages of the investigation are cut, glued, and assembled in the wrong order. And Vasily Shuisky changed his testimony several times. Therefore, there is an opinion that the preserved materials of the investigation are a final draft written in Moscow. And the drafts of the interrogations, drawn up at the scene of the events, have not survived. And it is not known for sure whether the boy existed at all. In our previous part Ivan the Terrible, we talked about the fact that Ivan the Terrible had only one son by the name of Dmitry, and he died not in 1591 but much earlier. And the man whom Shuisky and Romanovs declared an impostor was actually the legitimate heir to the Russian throne. Dmitry was the son of Tsar Ivan Ivanovich and the grandson of Ivan IV the Terrible and Anastasia Romanova. From birth, he was raised in the family of Romanovs. But when in 1572 Tsar Ivan Ivanovich was removed from power, Dmitry was tonsured as a monk and sent to a monastery. However, after some time, he escaped from the monastery, gathered troops in Poland, and started fighting for the throne. Later, when Shuisky ascended to the throne and False Dmitry was still fighting, it was advantageous for Shuisky to present False Dmitry as a pretender to the throne. Otherwise, it seemed that his opponent had more rights to the throne than Shuisky himself. A false version was created for purely political reasons that it was False Dmitry, and the famous Uglich Case was created, in which, incidentally, Shuisky had the most direct involvement. He signed everything there, as is known. And later, when the Romanovs came to power, they supported this version, and it was advantageous for them. It is precisely the royal origin of False Dmitry that explains many details of his biography that seem strange to historians. When Dmitry had just began his struggle for the throne, everyone who saw him recognized him as a prince. Polish aristocrats, Russian boyars, and even the mother of the supposedly deceased Prince Dmitry, Maria Nagaya, who had become a nun named Marfa, all acknowledged him as the prince. To the campaign, to the campaign! Long live Dmitry! Long live the Grand Prince of Moscow! To the campaign, to the campaign! On June 1, 1605, Dmitry was crowned tsar, and on July 18, he met with Marfa in the

village of Tayninskoye near Moscow, with a large crowd in attendance, and settled her in the Ascension Monastery of the Moscow Kremlin. Witnesses said that Marfa was surrounded by exceptional attention and care, and Dmitry, as a truly loving son, visited her every day. Another interesting fact is that False Dmitry was so confident in his royal lineage that he never feared exposure, including by the Poles. After his coronation, he boldly moved to aggravate relations with king Sigismund. He was not afraid of his own. Just a few days after Dmitry's coronation, based on a report from merchant Fyodor Konev, it was discovered that Prince Vasily Shuisky was plotting against the new Tsar. He was spreading rumors in Moscow that Dmitry was not actually a prince, but rather an unfrocked monk named Grishka Otrepyev, who planned to destroy churches and eradicate the Orthodox faith. Shuisky was arrested, and his fate was decided by the Council of boyars, the Zemsky Sobor. According to surviving documents, Tsar Dmitry was so eloquent and so skillfully accused Shuisky that the Council unanimously sentenced the traitor to death. On June 25, 1605, Shuisky ascended the scaffold, but by the order of the Tsar, he was pardoned and sent into exile in Vyatka. If Dmitry had feared exposure, he would not have missed the opportunity to get rid of the man who personally headed the investigation into the so-called Uglich tragedy. But Dmitry did not do that. As time showed, his action was very imprudent. The murderers of the Godunovs themselves sought the throne, and in less than a year, they succeeded in a coup, resulting in Vasily Shuisky ascending the throne. Fyodor Romanov, who was tonsured as a monk, was returned from exile. Once he himself dreamed of the royal throne, now Fyodor was elevated to the rank of Moscow patriarch. Such a quick overthrow of the new Tsar suggests that for conspirators Shuiskys, Golitsyns, and Romanovs, Dmitry was only an intermediate figure. It is believed that the conspirators killed Dmitry; otherwise Shuisky's coronation would have been impossible. But some evidence from that time suggests that this was most likely not the case. The first thing that causes confusion is the burning of the supposedly killed False Dmitry I's body. In Russia, neither friends nor enemies burned corpses. The enemy's body could be dug up, desecrated, but not burned. But Dmitry's corpse was burned. However, at first he was so mutilated that it was not only impossible to identify the murdered tsar in him, but even to see a human image. And in such a disfigured form, the corpse was presented to his mother, demanding his identification. They asked her, Speak, Queen Marfa, is this your son? Historians give several answers from Marfa. According to one version, she did not recognize her son, and according to another, she answered very evasively. But most likely, Marfa was shown the body of someone else, not her son. To prevent her from exposing the conspirators, the body was first disfigured and then burned. The fact that the so-called False Dmitry survived is evidenced by the fact that False Dmitry number two appeared on the historical stage. The subsequent events only confirm the assumption that the conspirators usurped power in the country while the legitimate tsar was still alive." There are even fewer reliable records about False Dmitry II in history than there are about False Dmitry I. It is practically impossible to create a complete picture of those events based on genuine documents. But one thing can be said with certainty. The man whom the Romanovs called the Criminal of Tushino had no less weirdness around him than his predecessor. The same crowds of people who in 1605 recognized the real prince in False Dmitry the First also recognized the new False Dmitry as the real Dmitry. Perhaps it was not difficult to deceive the crowd, but the lawful wife of False Dmitry I, Marina Mniszech, also recognized her husband in the new pretender. After False Dmitry II approached Moscow and stopped in Tushino, Marina and her father also came there. Historians claim that Jerzy Mniszech agreed to publicly recognize his son-in-law in False Dmitry only after the impostor gave him his

word to fulfill the promise of his predecessor to pay Mniszech 300,000 rubles and give him the Principality of Seversk with fourteen cities. Supposedly, only after this, under the pressure of her father, Marina agreed to play the role of False Dmitry's wife, but only for show. However, this assertion of historians, to put it mildly, does not correspond to reality. How else can one explain that soon after, Marina gave birth to a son by False Dmitry II, whom the Romanovs named the Little Criminal? In other words, they recognized him as the son of the Criminal of Tushino. It would be more correct to assume that neither Marina nor her father pretended and sold their recognition for mythical gifts that they might not have received if this new Dmitry were an impostor. Most likely, there was no False Dmitry number two. It was still the same legitimate tsar Dmitry, who, having gathered an army, marched on Moscow to punish the conspirators and traitors who had seized the throne. But, as historians believe, he did not succeed. And in December 1610, False Dmitry II was killed. Historians cannot explain Marina Mniszech's behavior after the death of False Dmitry. They do not understand why Marina did not leave rebellious Russia and continued to fight for the throne with the help of her loyal troops. Why, having been widowed, allegedly for the second time, did she not flee to her homeland in Poland, saving herself and her child? Perhaps because Marina knew who her husband really was. She knew that she was the real queen, and her son was the legitimate heir to the Russian throne. That is why Marina did not go to the Poles, but to the Cossacks on the Volga, Don, and Yaik. That is why she fought for the Russian throne, which rightfully belonged to her son, and not to the conspirators Shuiskys and Romanovs. And here, on the historical stage, Romanov historians bring out a certain Don Cossack named Ivan Zarutsky, who supposedly led the Cossack forces, first fighting on the side of False Dmitry II, and after his death, for Marina and her son. The history of Zarutsky and Marina's war with the Romanovs is one of the most obscure periods in Russian history. Most likely, the description of this war was completely fabricated by the victorious Romanovs. After all, there are testimonies that Zarutsky also called himself Tsar Dmitry Ivanovich. He received petitions and complaints under this name. And this is a very strange fact. It turns out that he was the third False Dmitry. Why did Zarutsky do this? Who did he want to deceive? His Cossacks, who knew him for years, or the people of Moscow, who repeatedly saw the real Tsar Dmitry? Most likely, it was not some unknown Cossack ataman Zarutsky who fought for the Russian throne with Marina Mniszech, but Tsar Dmitry Ivanovich, her husband, who was still alive at that time. However, the Romanovs certainly could not admit that they were actually fighting against the legitimate Russian Horde Tsar. They claimed that they were fighting against Cossack forces. And for this, they announced that their leader was a certain Zarutsky, behind whom there was just Marina Mniszech. It is possible that there really was an ataman Zarutsky in Dmitry's army, who fought with him against the Romanovs. But then, when the Romanov historians crossed out Dmitry's name, only Zarutsky's name remained, along with Marina Mniszech’s. When Dmitry and Marina's troops were defeated, the Romanovs managed to split the Cossack Union. The legitimate Tsar fled with his family to Yaik. But there they were caught by the Romanov troops and brought to Moscow. The usurpers of the throne, the Romanovs, dealt with the family of the last Russian tsar of the Rurik dynasty no less cruelly than with the Godunovs. In 1614, Tsar Dmitry was executed. The conspirators impaled him on a stake. It is not known for sure how Marina died. According to one version, she was hanged, according to another, drowned. It was also said that she was imprisoned in the round tower of the Kolomenskoye Kremlin, where she died prematurely. Obviously, the Romanovs did not spare Ivan, the little son of Marina and Dmitry. The boy was the legitimate heir to the throne and he could not be left alive. The Romanovs publicly hanged the four-year-old child

on the Spassky Gates of the Kremlin. The Time of Troubles became not only the beginning of a new stage in Russian history, the beginning of the rule of a new royal dynasty in Russia. This era became the end of the Great Russian Empire. With the fall of the Rurik dynasty, Russia lost for a long time the position in the world that it had held for about four hundred years. Huge territories in the West and East were lost forever. Even with the emergence of the Romanov Empire in the eighteenth century, Russia did not regain the power that it had in the past. In its history, a series of wars, internal strife, and confrontation between the parts of the once-unified empire began. But the main tragedy of Russia was that for many centuries it was under the rule of people of Western origin and pro-Western orientations. The centuries-old history and culture of the Russian people did not represent any value for them. Moreover, it was even dangerous. Future descendants, both in Russia and beyond its borders, should not have known the true history of the ancient Empire or the truth about the people and events that destroyed it. Therefore, immediately after the Romanovs' accession to the throne in Russia, systematic work began to falsify the history of the Russian state. Composing a new version of the world's historical development, the Romanovs' henchmen destroyed everything that did not correspond to this version. Ancient Russian culture lost a huge number of monuments of literature, applied art, and painting. Unique architectural structures were destroyed. The entire centuries-old way of life of the Russian people was destroyed. You can learn more about this in the next part, The First Romanovs.

## The First Romanovs

At the beginning of the 17th century, the Romanov dynasty came to power in Russia. After destroying their political opponents, the new rulers of Russia set out to destroy the history and ancient culture of the Russian people. A wave of demolitions swept across the country, resulting in the irretrievable loss of most of the historical monuments of the pre-Romanov era. This part will tell the story of some of them. It is known that architectural monuments contain a lot of information about the era to which they belong. Sometimes the decorations of palaces and temples can tell us more about the time of their creation than chronicles and government documents. The architecture of the 15th-17th centuries contained the authentic history of the old Russian empire. It is not surprising that with the arrival of the Romanovs to power, their fate was sealed. In the center of Moscow's Kremlin stand three famous cathedrals: the Assumption, Archangel, and Annunciation Cathedrals. It is believed that the Assumption Cathedral was built during the reign of Ivan III in the second half of the 15th century. From that time on, it became the main cathedral of the Russian Empire and always received special attention. In 1481, the best painter of that time, Dionisius, together with his team, painted a three-tiered iconostasis and several large icons in the cathedral. And at the beginning of the 16th century, it was adorned with frescoes. However, if you visit this majestic cathedral today, you won't see any of it. This is because in the middle of the 17th century, the ancient icons were replaced with new ones, and the beautiful frescoes by Dionisius were completely destroyed. According to the official version, the ancient icons and frescoes were greatly deteriorated, so they had to be replaced with new ones. But they were only about 150 years old. Why have they fallen into disrepair in such a short time? And this was not only the case with the Assumption Cathedral. At around the same time, by the order of Tsar Alexei Mikhailovich, all the

wall paintings in the Archangel Cathedral of the Kremlin were destroyed. They too were allegedly too old and unusable. Interestingly, frescoes painted in the 17th century, that is, already during the Romanovs' reign, were not destroyed after 100, 200, or even 300 years. Why, then, in the 17th century, was there a need to destroy frescoes that were relatively new, painted by the best icon painters of the 16th century? Moreover, the frescoes were deliberately destroyed. If they wanted to cover the walls of the cathedrals with new frescoes for some reason, why didn't they just paint over the old ones, as was done, for example, in the Annunciation Cathedral of the Kremlin? No, a huge amount of work was done specifically to remove the plaster from the entire surface of the walls and vaults of the Assumption and Archangel Cathedrals. Was it because the Romanovs wanted to destroy these images forever? Today, specialists claim that before the destruction of the frescoes, a description of the original compositions was made. Supposedly, this helped to preserve the conceptual idea and compositional scheme of the 16th century paintings. The Romanovs could have preserved the composition; it was not the issue. But what was specifically depicted on the destroyed frescoes, we will never know for sure. Unfortunately, ancient frescoes were destroyed not only in the Kremlin cathedrals. This is the Saviour Cathedral of the Andronikov Monastery of the Saviour in Moscow. It was painted by Andrei Rublev himself. But only small fragments of the original frescoes on the slopes of the altar windows are all that remains of the former splendor of the cathedral. By order of the Romanovs, all the frescoes of the Andronikov Monastery and its main cathedral were barbarously destroyed. Moreover, they were destroyed so barbarously that to this day, deep grooves from chisels and drills used to chip off priceless ancient Russian images are visible on the tiles. It is remarkable that the Romanovs did not even order these frescoes to be painted anew over with new frescoes. These walls have remained bare to this day. All of this shows some contempt, perhaps even with shades of mockery, on the part of the Romanovs towards ancient Russian history. They not only destroyed old gravestones, old temples, and old frescoes but also deliberately left bare and disfigured walls in their place. And this is the Cathedral of the Nativity of the Mother of God in the Luzhetsky man’s Monastery. Once upon a time, unique frescoes also adorned the walls of this cathedral, but they were destroyed in the 17th century. It is believed that there were never any frescoes there. However, recently when the layer of soil was removed in this monastery down to the 17th century layer, the surface of the earth from the second half of the 17th century was exposed. The destroyed frescoes were simply lying in a heap against the monastery wall. We saw them ourselves. Later, the Romanovs declared both the Polish-Lithuanian invaders and the Napoleonic occupiers to be responsible for the destruction of ancient Russian monuments. And terrible fires periodically occurred in Russia that miraculously destroyed exactly what hindered the Romanovs from promoting their version of Russian history. It is known that Peter the Great and his entourage did not like Moscow. The French courtier Lebua wrote that at the court of Peter the Great, the words Muscovite and Moskovia were deeply offensive. It is clear that deep political twilight must have descended upon Moscow, and especially the Moscow Kremlin. With the onset of the 18th century, the Kremlin Palace was abandoned. However, the Romanovs didn't just doom the ancient Russian Kremlin to neglect and gradual destruction; they decided to mock the ancient Russian holy sites. For example, in the Palace of the Facets they began to hold weddings for jesters. Celebrations and rituals that were impossible before were held within the ancient walls. Unique ancient frescoes were covered with lime. Instead of the previous solemn ambassadorial receptions, comedies and diolegias were played out here. Diolegias were plays in which there was no dramatic action, only conversations justifying the actions of the sovereign and ridiculing his enemies,

supporters of the Old Believers and therefore ignorance. For example, one such diolegia was arranged in 1702 on the occasion of the wedding of the jester Philat Shansky. The dilapidation of some of the buildings in the Kremlin Palace also occurred because at the behest of Peter, various collegiate bodies, chancelleries, and commissions were located there. Almost every collegiate organ moved to the Kremlin not only with its archives, officials, guards, and various petitioners but also transported its prisoners, who lived for months, and sometimes years, in the stone palace cellars. All this certainly multiplied the dirt that prematurely destroyed the ancient buildings. The idea of placing colonies of convicts and stables in the very heart of the former empire carried an unconditional ideological character. By smearing the former symbols and shrines of the Horde with dirt and horse manure, the new authorities vividly showed the people, who was now the master of conquered Russia. But even this was not enough for the new rulers. A tavern was opened in the Kremlin. It was located under the hill near the Taynitsky Gates. Drunken and reckless songs and cries of homeless resounded above the silent ancient cathedrals. From time to time, fights and stabbings broke out there. Law-abiding citizens shied away and avoided the now gloomy Kremlin. With each passing year, the Moscow Kremlin was being destroyed more and more. After a decade of destruction, the Romanov administrators drew up an estimate of the expenses required for its restoration. It became clear that a considerable sum of money was needed. Peter the Great did not provide the funds, presumably because there were more pressing matters in the state than the revival of a dilapidated structure that the new order of Russian life had long since condemned to destruction. In 1737, a new disaster struck the Kremlin. A terrible fire devastated Moscow, causing significant damage to the Kremlin palace. During this fire, almost the entire archive, which was located in the building of the Great Palace, was burned. 44 cabinets containing sorted and non-sorted files from previous years were burned down. Cadastre, inventory revision, boundary, and other books from 1571 to 1700 were lost. Thus, the most valuable Russian archives of the 16th and 17th centuries burned down, conveniently for Romanov historians. The Romanovs were so annoyed by ancient Russian traditions and memories of the former empire that they kept the Moscow Kremlin in a state of neglect until the beginning of the 19th century. It got to the point that in the early 19th century, the Romanov administration effectively handed over the Kremlin to the control of thieves and fraudsters. Criminal dens and houses of prostitution emerged in the Kremlin. Kremlin old-timers recounted that until 1812, it was scary to even go to the Kremlin cathedrals, especially in the evening. In the early 19th century, the Romanovs decided to restore the Moscow Kremlin. The restoration work was entrusted to Pyotr Valuyev. In 1801, Emperor Alexander I appointed him as the supreme commander of the Kremlin Expedition and the Armory Chamber. The Romanovs chose Valuyev for this job not by chance, as they were well aware of his dislike for Russia's past. Inspired by the silent support of the Romanov court, Valuyev began a systematic destruction of the surviving remnants of ancient Russian history. He began by demolishing the Sretenka Cathedral and the Armorial Tower in the Kremlin. Then in 1803, part of the Amusement Palace and part of the building which housed the Khlebenny (Bread) and Food Palaces were destroyed. In 1806, the Tsar Boris Godunov Palace was sold at auction. In 1807, the Trinity conventual church with the Church of the Epiphany, where the election of Mikhail Romanov as tsar was announced, was demolished. And in 1808, all the buildings of the rear courtyard of the royal palace with the Food, Bread, and Satiety palaces were demolished. In their place, an Armory Chamber and three cavalry corps were built. As a result of these changes, the Moscow Kremlin lost many ancient buildings. The remaining buildings, the Palace of Facets, the Terem Palace with its upper churches, and the Amusement

Palace were significantly restructured. Ten years later, the Kremlin could no longer be recognized. In its historical form, the Moscow Kremlin did not correspond to Valuyev's architectural tastes. If it were up to him, he would have demolished it altogether, leaving only those buildings that, in his opinion, had a neat appearance or were capable of taking on such an appearance after plastering and painting. It is well known that the Ascension Convent was located in the Kremlin. It was an Orthodox nunnery where the tombs of both common and noble nuns were located. Later, these tombs were declared the burials and tombs of Russian Horde queens of the pre-Peter era. In the 20th century, the Convent was destroyed, and the tombs were transferred into an annex of the Archangel Cathedral. And today, supposedly, we can see there the authentic burials of Russian Horde queens from the old era, the pre-Romanov era. In reality, this is an outright forgery. The names of supposedly Grand Russian queens, such as Sophia Palaiologina, were scratched with nails onto simple modest graves made of plaster and old plastered stone blocks. All of this needs a complete revision, and it is a vivid example of how the Romanovs and their historians falsified Russian history. Today, taking photos and videos of the so-called tombs of Russian queens is prohibited. You cannot even simply take a look at the burials because you can only enter the annex of the Archangel Cathedral with special permission, which is granted to a very narrow circle of people. Neither tourists nor our film crew were allowed in. We once again saw how securely historians guard the Romanovs' secrets. Destruction similar to that which the Romanovs committed in Moscow churches occurred in other Russian cities as well. And some ancient cathedrals were even blown up, after which new churches were built supposedly in the spirit of the old ones. In reality, the Romanovs simply destroyed the history of the Great Empire, replacing it with fiction. If ancient artifacts stood in the way of implementing this fiction, not only paper and ink were used, but also barrels of gunpowder. This is the Holy Trinity Ipatiev male Monastery in Kostroma. Before the 17th century, the monastery was the patrimony of the Godunovs, and after the Time of Troubles, the Romanovs made it a holy place for their dynasty. This is the main temple of the Ipatiev Monastery, the Trinity Cathedral, which was built in the 17th century, already during the time of the Romanovs. Before the 17th century, another Trinity Cathedral stood in its place, built during the time of the previous Russian Empire. About 60 people from the Godunov family were buried in the old church. However, in the 17th century, the old Trinity Cathedral accidentally exploded, and only a few sarcophagi and gravestones survived. Some of them bear the names of the deceased. No one knows for sure why the old Trinity Cathedral exploded. Historians explain this by saying that gunpowder was allegedly stored in its basement for a long time. Local tour guides cannot explain why the monks stuffed the basement with gunpowder, so they habitually blame the Godunovs. The fact that the cathedral exploded during the Romanovs' time is purely coincidental. In general, one should not dig into the past, as the truth cannot be uncovered. Interestingly, the official museum guide of the Ipatiev Monastery's burial vault of the Godunov boyars in Kostroma tells a different story about the cathedral's explosion. According to it, in the mid-17th century, the Trinity Cathedral was rebuilt and significantly expanded in size. Instead of the word exploded, historians evasively wrote rebuilt. Here, at the Ipatiev Monastery, we again encounter the boundary that separates the Romanov history from the ancient history of the Great Empire. This boundary is the era of the 17th century, when a powerful wave of remaking history swept through occupied Russia with a total cleansing of all traces. But the destruction of ancient Russian monuments continued even after the 17th century. The oldest church in Moscow, located on Red Square and beloved by Muscovites, was destroyed in one night. In the 18th century, by order of the Moscow Governor-General, it was dismantled,

destroyed, and buried. The pit was leveled in one night because the people simply did not allow it to be done. Ivan the Terrible's palace on the Sparrow Hills, where the Moscow University is now located, was also destroyed in the 18th century. It is not surprising that after these destructions many foreign tourists are surprised by how few traces of even recent past are left in Russia. Some people analyze the reasons; while others simply conclude that there was simply nothing worthy here. Not like in ancient Western Europe. One of the ancient Russian monasteries is located in Mozhaysk, the Nativity of the Theotokos Luzhetsky Monastery. It was founded in 1408 by Saint Therapont at the request of Andrey Dmitrievich Mozhaysky, son of Grand Duke Dmitry Donskoy. During the Time of Troubles, the monastery, like the entire city, was subjected to constant devastation. Gradually, thanks to donations, the Luzhetsky Monastery began to be restored. In the 1620s, the Transfiguration Church appeared in the monastery. A stone two-story cell building was built. In 1692, the monastery was decorated with a tent-shaped four-tiered bell tower. The fact that there was a lot of building activity in the Luzhetsky Monastery in the 17th century is evidenced by the results of archaeological excavations carried out in the monastery in 1999 and 2000. When builders removed two-meter layers of earth throughout the monastery's territory, it became apparent that old tombstones taken from Russian cemeteries were bricked into the foundations of the 17th-century buildings. There were a lot of tombstones used as building stones. It seemed that they were brought here from all the surrounding cemeteries. Interestingly, all these ancient tombstones, as a rule, do not resemble those that are presented to us today as supposedly antique Russian samples. Most of the slabs depict a three-pointed forked cross. We saw the same crosses on the tombstones of the Godunovs in the Ipatiev Monastery. After the top layer of soil was removed from the northern wall of the main monastery cathedral of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin Mary, the foundation of a small church built in the 17th century, more precisely after 1669, was revealed. The builders laid into the foundation not only old tombstones from the 16th century but also from the 17th century. There is a slab dated 7177, which is 1669 AD. Therefore, the foundation was laid after 1669 since this slab was already bricked into it. Interestingly, on the plaques indicating the dates of the Romanov era, the inscriptions and patterns are executed with the same high quality. The letters and patterns are deeply and beautifully carved into the stone, indicating the work of a professional carver. However, the plaques dated to the 16th century have a completely different appearance. While the pattern on the plaque is executed perfectly, the inscription is scratched haphazardly, as if with a simple nail. It is evident that the quality of the inscription is significantly lower than that of the pattern, even though they are on the same plaque. It is likely that all the tombstones dated to the 16th century are fake. It is possible that the old inscriptions were completely removed and new ones were scratched in their place. However, even after such a cleansing, the mute stones still looked incorrect to the Romanov historians with their wrong appearance. Therefore, they did not allow them to peacefully lie in cemeteries but they were laid in foundations, away from human eyes. And yet these slabs, one might say, were lucky. They became the foundation of the temple. Some tombstones were treated differently. For example, the famous Kirillo-Belozersky Monastery. Today, visitors to the monastery can walk to the main cathedral on a remarkable road paved with old stone slabs that, according to guides, were taken from the destroyed cemetery of the monastery dating back to the 15th and 16th centuries. The slabs were brutally removed, the burials destroyed and devastated, and the slabs in a disrespectful and mocking manner were laid in a road going along the buildings of the monastery to the main cathedral. At the end of the 17th century, after the reform of religious customs, new tombstones of the Romanov type began to be installed on Russian

cemeteries, which were completely different from the previous ones. And then they pretended it had always been that way. The story of the introduction of European customs to Russia during the era of Peter the Great is well-known to everyone. Literary novels and movies have formed a stable image of the reforming tsar who fought against the so-called vestiges of the past. However, it was not Peter who began the fight against the ancient Russian way of life. His predecessors, the Romanovs, were already doing so. For example, regarding clothing, Peter's brother, Tsar Fyodor Alexeyevich Romanov abolished the old Russian costume and introduced a foreign one, mainly Polish. But it was not enough for Peter to simply dress the Russians in European caftans. He decided to change even the appearance of Russian people, ordering all men to shave their faces clean, with the exception of those in spiritual orders. Among the boyars, beards were only allowed to be worn by the most noble, such as boyar Tikhon Streshnev and prince Mikhail Cherkassky. All other stubborn bearded men were ordered to be caught on the streets and have their beards forcibly cut off. The Romanov reforms also affected other aspects of Russian life. Today, one of the differences between European cathedrals and Russian Orthodox churches are the organs. The word organ refers to a pneumatic musical instrument with a bellows, in which metal pipes sound under the influence of air pressure. The prototype of the organ was most likely the bagpipe. It is believed that there were never any organs in Russian churches. However, this established opinion is most likely incorrect. Foreigners visiting Russia were surprised to discover original organs in many homes, which were inexplicably hidden in cabinets. The reason was that Peter the Great stubbornly eradicated organs. His contemporaries noted that he took great pleasure in a cappella singing, i.e. singing without instrumental accompaniment. Therefore, both organs and harmonicas were forced out of official Russian musical culture. In addition, organs reminded people of the old Russian Empire. As a result, Peter's fashion sense and personal taste had their effect. Since the foundation of St. Petersburg, the number of organists sharply decreased. In 1701, the old, excellently functioning workshop for the production of organs and harpsichords was destroyed in the Moscow fire. It was not rebuilt, and in Moscow, the last celebration using 27 organs was the wedding of the jester Shansky. By the way, in Russia, the accordion and bayan are still widely used. It is believed that the history of these musical instruments can only be traced back to the beginning of the 19th century. However, it is absolutely obvious that both the accordion and the organ are constructed on the same principle. The bellows pump air through the valves or pipes of the instrument, resulting in sounds of different tones. Perhaps the accordion and the organ are two versions of the same instrument. The only difference is that large organs were installed in large buildings, such as churches, while small accordions could be carried around. For 300 years, Romanov historians made great efforts to convince us that the musical culture of ancient Russia, like all Russian culture during the pre-Romanov period, was at a low, almost rudimentary level. In other words, it simply did not exist. Folk songs, pipes, and drums. Can this be compared to the refined musicians of Versailles? However, in 1711, a book by the Dutch traveler Cornelis de Bruijn, Voyage over Muscovy to Persia and India, was published in Amsterdam. This work was translated into almost all European languages. In his book, de Bruijn wrote that in Moscow, he heard music literally at every step. Oboists, horn players, and timpanists in military formation. Whole orchestras of the most diverse instruments, including the organ at the Triumphal Gate. Few people know another interesting fact, that composer Antonio Vivaldi was supposed to move to Moscow for permanent work. However, the trip did not take place, and his students came to Moscow instead. One of them was the violinist and composer Giovanni Verocai. Certainly, these remarkable musicians were not heading to a wild

country, but to a country with a highly developed musical culture, where there were organs, large instrumental orchestras, their own excellent musicians, and masters who created excellent musical instruments. But, as it is known, the imposition of new customs affected not only everyday life or musical culture but also architecture. Today we are told that the church we see, built in the Greek style, is supposedly an old Russian style dating back to the 10th – 12th centuries. This is not true. Apparently, the old Russian architectural style of cathedrals and churches is familiar to us today from surviving churches in Western Europe, which are called Gothic or, as we understand it, Goths churches. In fact, such churches existed throughout the empire from the 14th to the early 17th centuries. Then the Romanovs changed the style and introduced a new style in the 17th-18th centuries, which they declared to be very old. Old Russian cathedrals built in the Gothic style were destroyed, smashed, and blown up. Something remained, some cathedrals, for example, in the city of Uglich or Yaroslavl, still retain the style of a Gothic cathedral, which, as we now well understand, did not come to us from Western Europe, but the other way around, Western Europe is a trace memory of the old Horde architecture that once reigned throughout the entire Mongol Empire. Thus, after their ascension to the Russian throne, the Romanovs eradicated all evidence of the existence of the Great Empire that stretched to all corners of the known world. Naturally, the greatest threat to the Romanovs were the written sources. They reflected everything, both the true history of the Russian state and their place in this state. As is known, in medieval Russia, there was a special order of appointment to higher government positions based on the ancestry and hierarchical position of ancestors in the Grand Prince's and Tsar's service. This order was called mestnichestvo. All appointments to government positions were based on this hierarchy and recorded in special category books, Razriad books, which preserved the history of state appointments in Russia in the 15th-16th centuries. This order existed until the last year of Tsar Fyodor Alexeyevich Romanov's reign. But on January 12, 1682, the Romanovs dealt another blow to the noble boyars and abolished the system of mestnichestvo in Russia. Immediately after that, the old Razriad books were destroyed and new ones were compiled, which were supposed to cover practically all layers of service people of that time. The work of compiling genealogical register was entrusted to a specially formed Genealogical Commission, which received the name Chamber of Pedigree Affairs. Two genealogical register books were compiled. One of them is known as the Velvet Book, the other has not been found to this day. At the end of the 19th century, the famous Russian historian Nikolay Petrovich Likhachyov studied the Velvet Book. He first raised the question of so-called composite lineage. Likhachev discovered that the individuals listed in these genealogies were usually borrowed from available written sources by the compiler, and then grouped into generations, with some names even being entirely made up. For example, the Golovkins genealogy was compiled in this way. To prove the authenticity of the fabricated genealogies, extensive falsification of ancient records was widely carried out, especially since their authenticity was not being verified by anyone. As many researchers have established, no documentary verification of genealogies was ever conducted in the Chamber of Pedigree Affairs. Nikolay Petrovich Likhachyov paid special attention to identifying and criticizing the falsified acts submitted to the Chamber of Pedigree Affairs along with genealogies. He considered the acts of the Izmailovs, Bedovs, Protasievs, and Chaadaevs to be fraudulent. Another Russian historian, Stepan Borisovich Vasilovsky, who studied the Romanovs genealogies, believed that most of them were not based on accumulated genealogical materials passed down from generation to generation, but were fabricated retrospectively. In other words, most of the genealogies of the Romanov nobility were invented in the late 17th century. It should be

noted that not only the genealogies of the Romanov nobility were falsified, but first and foremost, the genealogies of the Romanovs themselves were also falsified. Because during the reign of Mikhail Fyodorovich, when the Romanov dynasty came to power, Russian books of Moscow printing, in church books, in publisher's imprint, that is, in official sources, it was asserted that Mikhail Fyodorovich Romanov was the son of Fyodor Ivanovich and the grandson of Ivan Vasilyevich. This was directly asserted. This was a forgery of the new dynasty's royal genealogy, a direct forgery. They started with this, with such a forgery. If the Romanovs were not afraid to lie to even their contemporaries who knew their true genealogy, then what can be said about their descendants? All of this was done in the interests of the Romanovs themselves and their entourage. In the former empire, they were at the bottom of the parochial hierarchy. The truth about their origins was recorded in old Razriad books. It is not surprising that after the Romanovs seized power, these books were destroyed. For centuries, Romanov historians engaged in the destruction and falsification of documents, because for the Romanovs themselves, falsifying history was a matter of life and death. They had to hold on to power at all costs; otherwise they would not have been able to avoid retribution. And for this, they resorted to any measures. It is known that until the end of the 17th century, in Moscow there was the Book of Degrees of the Royal Genealogy, known as Stepennaia book, compiled at the initiative of the priest of Ivan the Terrible, Metropolitan Macarius of Moscow, in 1560-1563. The book contained a narrative of Russian history from the first Russian princes to the time of Ivan Vasilyevich. It can be said that this was a grand portrait gallery of Russian rulers of the Rurik dynasty. In the 16th-17th centuries, the Stepennaia book was one of the most popular historical works. At that time, it had a great influence on various spheres of societal life, even on monumental wall painting of those years. For example, under its influence, the painting of the Archangel Cathedral of the Moscow Kremlin was created. By the way, it was completely justifiably stated in this book that the Rurik dynasty descended from the Roman Emperor Augustus. However, during the reign of Alexei Mikhailovich, the Stepennaia book, which was kept in the Recording department, aka Zapisnoy Prikaz, mysteriously disappeared. Therefore, the Romanovs had to compile a new Stepennaia book. In 1672, the Great State Book or Root of the Russian Sovereigns, often called the Book of Titles, was compiled in the Ambassadorial Prikaz, which was Ministry of Foreign Affairs at that time. This book contained portrait images of Kiev and Moscow princes and tsars from Rurik to Alexei Mikhailovich in chronological order. Since the Stepennaia book of the Rurik dynasty disappeared, the writers of the Ambassadorial Prikaz could easily compose the Book of Titles in the spirit that was pleasing to the new Romanov dynasty. Another interesting book describes the genealogy of Russian rulers, which was published in Moscow almost simultaneously with the Book of Titles. This work was written by Lavrenty Khurelich, who visited Moscow in 1656 as part of the embassy of the Austrian Emperor Leopold the 1st. And in 1673, Khurelich wrote the book, Genealogy of the Most Holy and Noble Grand Dukes of Moscow, also known as the Genealogy. Using genealogical tables, Khurelich attempted to establish the place of Alexei Mikhailovich Romanov among other European monarchs. In 1674, Khurelich sent his book to Moscow, which was recorded in the documents of the Ambassadorial Prikaz. Why did Khurelich decide to describe the genealogy of Russian rulers and why did he think that his work would be of interest to the Russian Tsar? It seems that the Austrian diplomat compiled some new genealogy of Russian princes and tsars and sent it to Alexei Romanov as an instruction on the new, correct Russian history. It is possible that all representatives of the new royal dynasty were later required to follow this instruction. However, despite the efforts of the Romanovs, not

everyone initially believed in their royal ancestry. In the first half of the 17th century, certain books began to be published in Poland, the content of which we do not know today, but apparently they were interesting books that did not call the Romanov boyars tsars, but leaders or in some other way. They described their origin in a different way. So the Romanovs sent a whole delegation to Poland with the following demand: to burn all the books, to execute all the typesetters, to execute all the owners of the areas where these books were published, and, in general, to execute all the people who were related to these books and could know their contents. This demand was made by the Romanovs to the Polish king after several books were published in Poland that spoke about the Romanovs in a different light than we are used to. It is not known for certain how the Polish king reacted to this demand. However, it is known that in 17th-century Europe, chronicles were published in which nothing was said about the Romanovs at all. For example, Wilhelm Stratemann's well-known work Theatrum historicum, published in 1680, described all the events known at that time in world history. It contains several facts from Russian history, including the 17th century. But there is not a single mention of the Romanov Tsars. There is a mention of Ivan the Terrible, but nothing about the Romanovs. If the Romanovs really had an ancient dynasty, they would have been mentioned in the chronicles of that time. Romanov historians falsified not only Razriad books, chronicles, and state documents from the era of the former Great Empire. Geographical maps also contained a vast amount of information about the country they destroyed. Unfortunately, today few people know about the outstanding Russian cartographer of the 18th century, Ivan Kirillovich Kirilov. In 1727, he became a chief secretary of the Senate and a secretary of the commission on commerce. He was knowledgeable in geography, mathematics, physics, history, and astronomy. In the State Chancellery he was listed as an expert in topographical surveying of the Earth. Therefore, when Peter the Great decided to create a geographic atlas of his possessions, Kirilov was appointed responsible for this enterprise. He planned to publish a series of detailed maps. The complete work consisted of three volumes, with 120 maps each, including a general map of the country. But the Imperial Academy decided to prohibit Kirilov's atlas. As a result, 360 excellent geographic maps were destroyed. Even the printing plates were destroyed. In the end, only two copies of Ivan Kirilov's atlas were registered, one of which had defects. Separate sheets printed from the original plates are extremely rare to find today. Modern researchers say that from 1726 until his death in 1737, Kirilov managed to print and prepare for printing 37 maps, 28 of which have survived to this day. As for the 360 maps of the unpublished atlas, they are mentioned almost in passing, and not a word is said about the fact that these maps were destroyed. Today you can see several supposedly surviving maps from this atlas, but their authenticity is in doubt. For example, the general map of the Russian Empire, allegedly released in St. Petersburg in 1734. The fact that Moscow Tartary, the largest state of the time, is completely absent from the map suggests that it is likely a forgery. Could a master like Ivan Kirilov know nothing about it? Certainly, one could assume that by 1734 Moscow Tartary had ceased to exist as an independent state, so it is not on the map. But here is a map made by cartographers of the British Encyclopedia in 1771, 37 years after the appearance of the map attributed to Kirilov. Here, Moscow Tartary is depicted very clearly. Another strange moment is that all the names on Kirilov's map are written in Latin. Only explanatory inscriptions in the upper left and lower left corners are in Russian. One could assume that at that time it was customary to draw up geographical maps in this way, to do everything in the western style. But here is a map created at approximately the same time by the Russian cartographer Vasily Kiprianov. This world map was created personally for Peter the Great, but all the inscriptions on it are in Russian. It

is unlikely that the Russian cartographer Ivan Kirilov made Latin inscriptions on his general map of the Russian Empire. Most likely, his authentic map was made in Russian. But the Romanov falsifiers destroyed it, as well as most of Kirilov's maps. And then they simply took some suitable from their point of view foreign map of Russia and attributed it to the famous cartographer. So what was wrong with the maps of Ivan Kirilov, one of the best specialists of his time, according to the Imperial Academy of Sciences? According to the official version, Kirilov's geographic atlas was not accurate and precise enough, so it took 11 more years to work on a new atlas. But most likely, the reason was different. Kirilov's maps simply hindered the Romanovs from promoting their new version of Russian history. It is likely that these maps clearly included Moscow Tartary, which until the end of the war with Pugachev was not only an independent but also a hostile state for the Romanovs. Romanov historians removed all mentions of it from any documents that fell into their hands. And it is clear that the decision to destroy such a unique work as the atlas of Ivan Kirilov was not made at the Academy of Sciences, but at the highest levels of government. 360 magnificent maps and even printing plates could be destroyed only by the highest order. Fortunately, not all incorrect geographical maps were destroyed. Some of them have been preserved. However, historians prefer not to talk about them and hide them in archival storage and museum reserves. For example, a fragment of a large antique atlas of the Russian Empire, compiled by the outstanding Russian cartographer Semyon Remezov, is no longer exhibited at the Hermitage. Perhaps because many geographical names in this atlas also do not correspond to traditional history. It is known that during the time of Peter the Great, the attitude towards this map was very skeptical. Peter the Great liked to invite guests to the map that hung on the wall of his palace and showed it as a curiosity, demonstrating how ignorant Russian tsars were, who filled the large map with strange and ridiculous names. As we understand, there was nothing ridiculous in these names. These were ancient Russian names that were later erased by Romanov historians and cartographers from the map of the Russian Empire. In 1613, the Romanovs who came to power did everything possible to justify their right to the Russian throne and prevent a return to the old imperial orders. Throughout their reign, they corrected and rewrote Russian history. This was done not only in the interests of the Romanovs themselves, but also in the interests of other new states that appeared on the world map after the collapse of the Great Russian Empire. These were the European countries that were primarily interested in writing a new version of history. In 1917, the era of the Romanovs' rule tragically came to an end. The last Tsar, Nicholas II, was probably the most Russian of this pro-Western dynasty, despite having almost no Russian blood. Perhaps it was the very life of Russia, its vast expanses, its people, and its culture that assimilated the Romanovs and still forced them to build a powerful Russian state. One could say that the mutation of the Russian tsars of the Romanov dynasty began with Peter the Great. It was he who restored Russia's status as an empire and reintroduced the title of emperor. In his will, Peter the Great wrote about the need to restore a world empire. Many Russian and European historians studied and described Russia's past. Each of them had their own attitude towards Russia and its history. Each gave their own assessment of the Russian state and its rulers. Why some historians were forgotten, while others became official historians of the country, you can see in our next part, How Russian History Was Written.

## How Russian History Was Written

Many Russian historians were engaged in studying and describing the history of Russia, such as Tatishchev, Lomonosov, Karamzin, Klyuchevsky, Kostomarov, Solovyov, and Zabelin. Foreigners also wrote extensively about Russian history, for example, Müller and Schlözer. Each of them had their own attitude towards Russia and its history, and each gave their own assessment of the Russian state and its rulers. Therefore, reading and comparing the works of these authors, one understands that everything they wrote cannot be considered the true history of Russia. These are only different historical versions proposed by different historians. And ultimately, our knowledge and understanding of Russian history depend on which authors we read. Specifically, which authors we are taught to read from childhood. After all, in every country, every nation has a so-called official history. Russia has one too. In this part, we will talk about who wrote Russian history and when. The creation of the version of Russian history that is widely known today began in the early 17th century after the ascension of the first Romanovs. In 1672, in Moscow, the Great State Book or Root of the Russian Sovereigns, also known as the Book of Titles, was compiled in the Ambassadorial Prikaz which was Ministry of Foreign Affairs at that time. And in 1674, the first official edition of the new version of Russian history was published, called Synopsis. However, it was only in the 18th century that the creation of an official version of Russian history became a matter of state importance and was put on academic footing. It is commonly believed that Vasily Nikitich Tatishchev was the first Russian historian, a prominent statesman of the first half of the 18th century. He managed state-owned factories in the Urals, then was the governor of Astrakhan for several years, and was involved in geography and economics. For 20 years, Tatishchev collected ancient Russian historical documents. Based on them, he wrote the history of the Russian state and intended to publish it in 1740. However, it turned out to be impossible to publish this unique work in Russia. Then Tatishchev tried to publish his work in England, but this attempt also failed. What was the reason? It turns out that in 1719 Tatishchev read Nestor's Chronicle. This was a copy of the Radziwill Chronicle, which Peter the Great brought from Königsberg four years earlier. Tatishchev made a copy of this manuscript for himself, and some time later, he found another copy of Nestor's Chronicle with a schismatic in Siberia. To his surprise, he discovered that it was a completely different document. It turned out that there was more than one Nestor's Chronicles. Gradually, Tatishchev collected a dozen such manuscripts. Based on them, he compiled his work and brought it from Astrakhan to St. Petersburg to show to various knowledgeable people who, as he believed, might approve and endorse it. But instead of support, Tatishchev was accused of free-thinking and heresy. As a result, Tatishchev's many years of work did not see the light during his lifetime and was eventually lost. What is now called Tatishchev's history is just his diaries, published a few years after the scientist's death under the editorship of Gerhard Müller, a Russian historian of German origin and one of the founders of traditional Russian history. In his preface to the first volume, Müller openly wrote that he corrected Tatishchev's text. In the original, there are sometimes mistakes in the proper names of foreign writers, peoples and cities. I was entrusted with correcting the aforementioned places. And I took this upon myself all the more willingly, than it seemed to me necessary, especially when it came to those chapters that were translated from ancient Greek and Latin writers. To what extent Müller thoroughly edited Tatishchev's texts, even his contemporaries could not determine, since no authentic drafts or other manuscripts of Tatishchev's history were

seen by anyone. Moreover, this edition by Müller for some reason did not include the first part of Tatishchev's work, which describes the history of Russia before Rurik. Thus, calling Tatishchev the founder of Russian historiography can be quite conditional. And surprisingly, foreign historians are the true authors of official Russian history. For the past 300 years, few in Russia and Europe have talked about the fact that the 18th century was a period of fierce struggle by Russian society for the right to have its own domestic science. It is difficult to imagine now, but at that time, the very existence of Russian science was under question. No European nation was denied this right, and only Russians had to prove it in a struggle not only with European scientists but also with their own government. In the 1730s, during the reign of Empress Anna Ioannovna, Russia was simply flooded with foreigners, including those from the scientific class. At that time, out of 89 members of the Russian Academy of Sciences, only 17 were Russians. The poet Vyazemsky, a well-known wit in his time, called the Academy the German Quarter. Foreign professors and academics had complete control in the Petersburg Academy of Sciences and in the Academic Gymnasium, which trained future students. The teaching process seemed to be deliberately designed in such a way that no truly educated person would graduate from the Gymnasium. How could Gymnasium students learn anything if teaching was conducted not in their native Russian language but exclusively in Latin and German? And all because the teachers, imported from Germany, did not know Russian and did not want to learn it, while the Gymnasium students did not know German. Over a period of 30 years, from 1726 to 1755, the Gymnasium did not prepare a single person for admission to the Academy. However, the leaders of the Gymnasium did not blame themselves or their educational system, but rather Russian students. They claimed that Russians were simply incapable of learning sciences and that it was impossible to prepare them for admission to the Academy. The way out for Russian science was to invite specialists and students from Europe, which they did for a long time. It is not surprising, therefore, that the founders of the so-called scientific version of Russian history were foreign scientists, namely Germans. The first to lay the foundations of this version was Gottlieb Siegfried Bayer. Bayer was one of the first academics of the St. Petersburg Academy of Sciences. In 1725, he was invited to Russia by the president of the Academy, Blumentrost. Bayer headed the department of Eastern antiquities and languages. For 12 years, Bayer lived in Russia, studying Eastern culture and working on the creation of Russian history. It is difficult to understand how he did this, as he did not read ancient Russian chronicles. In his 12 years in Russia, he never learned Russian. As the historian Klyuchevsky wrote, Bayer simply did not want to learn it. So the man whom historians still worship as one of the pillars of Russian historical science could not speak or read Russian. Therefore, Bayer studied the early history of Russia from foreign sources, such as Greek, Latin, German, and Scandinavian. It is not surprising that it was Bayer who first proposed the so-called Norman theory of the origin of the Russian state. It was this academic who first declared that the Slavs were a wild, barbaric people, incapable of building their own state. And that, supposedly, it was only thanks to Varangian princes, that Russians finally emerged from the darkness of ignorance. The fact that Bayer knew very little about Russian historical documents is evident, for example, from the fact that he did not know that the first published version of Russian history, Synopsis, was not a chronicle, but a history textbook. Perhaps he did not need to know this, just as he did not need to read Russian chronicles. Foreign historians in Russia had a different task, to write a version of Russian history that the Romanovs ordered. And Gottlieb Bayer succeeded in this task. He wrote a treatise on the Varangians, which later became the basis of the so-called Norman theory of the origin of Russia. The successor to Bayer became Gerhard Friedrich Müller,

also a German. He also came to Russia in 1725, also at the invitation of Blumentrost. At that time, Müller was only 20 years old, so he became not an academician like Bayer, but initially only an academic student of the newly established St. Petersburg Academy of Sciences, and taught at the Gymnasium that opened at the Academy. In 1731, at the age of 25, with the support of the Academy's chancery secretary, the German Schumacher, Müller had already become a professor, despite the absence of independent research and the agreement of the academicians. After some time, he realized that his only way to success in Russia was to engage in Russian historiography, which was supported by academician Bayer. To enable Müller to participate in the development of Russian historical sources, Bayer advised him to start learning Russian immediately, which Bayer himself never did. From 1733 to 1743, Müller worked on expeditions in Kamchatka and Siberia, where he searched for ancient documents. He started studying the Siberian archives from Tobolsk, and then searched through archives in many other cities. He hired scribes to copy the documents that interested him, and brought all these copies with him to St. Petersburg. This collection of documents, more than 30 volumes, became known as Müller's portfolios. It is unknown according to what principle Müller selected the documents for copying and what happened to the originals. It is also unknown which of these texts are actually copies, and which were edited or written by Müller himself. In 1747, Müller resumed his relationship with the Academy and was officially appointed as a historian after becoming a Russian subject. Interestingly, before starting to work on processing ancient documents, he had to sign, in modern terms, a non-disclosure agreement regarding state secrets. In 1749, a significant event for Russian historical science happened. Müller prepared a speech that he planned to deliver at a solemn meeting of the Academy. The speech was titled Origin of the Russian People and their Name. In it, Müller developed the idea, which he considered justified, about the Scandinavian origin of the Russian state, proposed by Bayer. The speech caused outrage among the academics. Mikhail Lomonosov called the speech a nightmarish one. He wondered why the author missed the best opportunity to praise the Russian people. Not only Lomonosov but also Krasheninnikov, Popov, and other academics accused Müller of not showing any case in the whole speech that could glorify the Russian people, but only mentioning what could serve to their dishonor, namely, how they were repeatedly defeated in battles, and that they were devastated by robbery, fire, and sword, and their tsars were robbed of their treasures. As a result, the speech was deemed detrimental to Russia. A decision was made to seize and destroy it. And it seemed that this academic conflict was resolved smoothly for Russian science. But after 18 years, Müller's speech was still published in Sweden, and after another hundred years, it firmly established itself in textbooks. The Norman theory of the origin of the Russian state became the official doctrine of the Romanov dynasty. In 1766, thanks to Prince Golitsyn, Müller became the head of the Moscow Archive of the Collegium of Foreign Affairs. This was not just a bureaucratic position. Müller was allowed access to an enormous archive that was extremely important for Russian history. Diplomatic correspondence of the Moscow government from the end of the 15th century was stored here. The documents were preserved in remarkable completeness. In this atmosphere Müller felt at home. He began a systematic description of the archive. But the former academic did not come to this position to compile inventories. He began to process the material found there. Moreover, he wanted to write a new Russian history, starting from the time of False Dmitry the first. After the scandalous speech on the Origin of the Russian People and their Name, Lomonosov kept a close eye on Müller for a long time. He was very afraid of his work. His attacks on Müller were not caused by personal antipathy. Lomonosov was a patriot, and in each of Müller's

works, he saw spitefulness and prejudiced speeches about the Russian people. Lomonosov said that Müller only noticed the stains on the Russian body's clothes, not its ornaments. And yet, it is quite obvious that the results of Müller's activity suited the Romanovs perfectly. Catherine the Great especially favored Müller. She bought his handwritten library from him for the fantastic sum of 20,000 rubles, which was a huge amount of money for those times. In 1761, August Ludwig Schlözer was employed by Gerhard Müller as a servant. Schlözer never aimed to live in Russia. His dream was the Orient, Egypt, and Palestine. But such journeys required money, which he did not have. At the recommendation of one of his university teachers, Schlözer found a job in Russia. It was a position as a teacher in Müller's house. Gradually, Müller began to attract Schlözer to work with his archive of manuscripts. Schlözer quickly realized that Russian historiography was an area that could give him both quick fame and good money. He began to study Church Slavonic language. After some time, Schlözer became an adjunct. He wanted to establish himself in the Academy of Sciences, so he presented two of his plans for consideration by the academics. A plan for the development of Russian history and a plan for familiarization with the history of Russian society. In other words, the creation of an official historical version and its subsequent propaganda. Schlözer believed that to develop Russian history, all major sources, especially chronicles and foreign reports about Russia must be subjected to preliminary critical processing. That is, Russian history had to be what Schlözer would compose. Lomonosov, having read this plan, became extremely irritated. When the German academics approved it, Lomonosov presented a note expressing his opinion in a very sharp form. According to Lomonosov, the opinion of foreign professors on this subject means nothing because, as foreigners, they themselves have no idea about the matter. Schlözer needs to learn a lot more to be a professor of Russian history, and, finally, there is simply no place for him in the Academy. But Schlözer thought differently. He believed that he was capable of not only writing a textbook on the history of Russia. Schlözer began compiling Russian grammar, with a very original interpretation of Russian words. For example, in his opinion, the word boyar was derived from the word baran (ram), and the Russian word knyaz (prince) from the German word knecht, which means servant. Even Müller stated that Schlözer should not be allowed to access Russian documents or to study Russian history at all. But Schlözer asked for permission to work on the development of Russian history from Catherine the Great herself and under her patronage. He received her consent along with the position of academician. He presented his works for approval personally to Catherine. Moreover, Schlözer was granted access to all libraries and archives. Lomonosov wrote about this bitterly: there is nothing left to protect. Everything is open to the madman Schlözer. And all Russian historians of the 19th century, from Karamzin to Solovyov, looked at this man as the first teacher, the founder of Russian history, and followed his methods. The natural question arises: where were the Russian scholars? Why did the work on the development of Russian history end up in the hands of foreigners? In what other European countries did foreigners describe local history? Certainly, in Russia there were scientists who opposed this. And the most ardent defender of Russian history was Mikhail Vasilyevich Lomonosov. In February 1742, Mikhail Vasilyevich Lomonosov supported the complaint that teachers and officials of the Academy of Sciences filed with the Senate against the secretary and treasurer of the Academy, Schumacher, and his son-in-law, the Academy's librarian Taubert. Although at this time Lomonosov had just received the title of adjunct, which finally gave him the right to independent scientific work and participation in academic meetings, he could not remain aloof from the struggle of his colleagues. The complaint stated that no Russian person had been promoted to professor since the

founding of the Academy, and even teaching Russian youths had ceased. Since the opening of the Academy, the understanding of its purpose had changed. Originally, the St. Petersburg Academy of Sciences was created to train Russian scientists. However, as a result, the Russian Academy began to educate foreign students who could later flee to their homelands. In other words, without establishing the production of its own scientists, Russia began to produce them for foreign countries, and at its own expense. Therefore, it did not matter to Russia whether such an academy existed or not. The complainants demanded that the Academy of Sciences be transformed into a Russian institution not only in name. To consider this complaint, the Senate created a commission, which included people who had no knowledge of the affairs of the Academy and had no understanding of them. After allegedly thorough investigation, the Senate commission declared that the statements made by the Academy employees were just an uprising of the common people against their superiors. As a result, the Senate commission made a monstrous decision. Schumacher and Taubert were recognized as the injured party, and it was decided to reward them. On the contrary, Russian scientists who dared to speak out against foreign domination in Russian science were punished. Some of them were put in chains and shackles. They remained in this position for about two years but never recanted their testimony. The complainants were found guilty by Empress Elizabeth Petrovna but were exempted from punishment. However, all of them were dismissed from the Academy. And certainly, foreign academicians did not miss the opportunity to deal away with Lomonosov. For his participation in the rebellion, the Senate commission demanded the death penalty for him, or at the very least, corporal punishment and deprivation of rights and property. Lomonosov spent seven months under house arrest awaiting the highest decision. The Empress did not support the commission's demands, and Lomonosov was released from punishment. However, at the same time, his salary was halved, and he had to apologize to the foreign professors for his insolence. Lomonosov's main opponent, Müller, composed a mocking repentance that Lomonosov publicly recited and signed. This was the first and last time that Lomonosov was forced to abandon his views. Until the end of his life, Lomonosov devoted a lot of time to studying Russian history. History was as important to him as natural sciences. Therefore, he sharply criticized Müller's dissertation on the origin of the name and people of Russia. He gave a devastating critique of Bayer's works on Russian history. This is what Lomonosov wrote about Bayer: It seems to me that he is much like some kind of idolatrous priest who, having smoked himself with white incense and stupefied with it, and spinning around on one leg, twists his head and gives incomprehensible and completely wild answers. Despite the strong opposition from foreign academicians, Lomonosov consistently fought for Russian science. Thanks to him, several Russian academicians and adjuncts still appeared in the Russian Academy of Sciences. But Müller, naturally, did not give up. He succeeded in removing Lomonosov from the leadership of the geographical department and took his place. Moreover, even during Lomonosov's lifetime, Müller tried to obtain the highest order to transfer all of Lomonosov's materials on the Russian language and history to his disposal. But Müller fully got back at Lomonosov only after the death of the great Russian scientist. On the very next day after his death, by order of Catherine the Great, the archive of Mikhail Vasilyevich was confiscated and disappeared without a trace. It is likely that Müller still managed to get to the unique archive and simply destroyed it. However, seven years after Mikhail Vasilyevich’s death, under Müller's full control, Lomonosov's work on Russian history was published, which he could not publish during his lifetime. When you read this work, it becomes completely unclear why Lomonosov fought against German professors for so many years and accused them of falsifying

Russian history. In every line, Lomonosov agrees with them on everything. It turns out that publicly Lomonosov was fighting against German creators of Russian history, but at home, in the quiet of his office, he secretly wrote a version of history that practically coincided with the version of his main opponent, Müller. The impression is that this work was not written by Lomonosov, but by Müller. It is not surprising that many researchers of Lomonosov's works doubted the authenticity of this work, but could not substantiate their doubts. However, in the 1970s, a method appeared that allows us to determine whether a literary work belongs to a particular author or not. This method was developed by Soviet scientists Valentina Polikarpovna and Timofey Grigorievich Fomenko. Valentina Polikarpovna and Timofey Grigorievich Fomenko made an important discovery in linguistics. They found that there is a very interesting author's invariant in the Russian language, that is, a parameter that allows different groups of authors to be distinguished from each other. To calculate the author's invariant of a specific writer, you need to divide the text of their work into several parts, each of which will contain an equal number of words. The more words in each part, the more accurate the study will be. The most accurate result can be obtained if each part contains at least 16,000 words. Therefore, voluminous works, such as War and Peace by Tolstoy, are suitable for such research, but short stories and essays are not. So, by dividing the text of the novel into several equal parts, you need to determine how many function words are contained in each part, that is, prepositions, conjunctions, and particles. The percentage of function words in each part of the work is the author's invariant. Valentina and Timofey Fomenko conducted a unique experiment that had never been done before. They manually calculated the percentage of function words in the works of almost 80 authors who wrote in Russian, without using computers. It turned out that in the works of the same author, the percentage of function words would always be the same. This is what it looks like on a graph, with the horizontal axis representing the number of parts of the text and the vertical axis representing the percentage of function words. Typically, it does not exceed 30%. For example, Leo Tolstoy's author's invariant looks like this, with the percentage of function words in his work being 23.6%. And this is Fyodor Dostoevsky's author's invariant, with the percentage of function words in his works being 25.3%. Anatoly Fomenko and his colleagues Gleb Nosovsky and Nicolai Kellin used this method to determine the author's invariant of Müller and Lomonosov. Here's what they found. Lomonosov's author's invariant was calculated using his work A Brief History of the Academic Chancellery, because this text contains more than 16,000 words and its authenticity is beyond doubt. Müller's author's invariant was calculated using his work, Information about Russian Nobles. This work also meets all the necessary requirements for conducting research. It is written in Russian and contains more than 16,000 words. The following results were obtained. Lomonosov's author's invariant is 20-21%, and Müller's invariant is 28%. Then, the authors of the New Chronology calculated the author's invariant of the Ancient Russian History, which historians attribute to Lomonosov. It turned out that the percentage of function words in this work ranges from 24 to 27%. Based on the previous results obtained from approximately 80 Russian authors and writers, we must state that the text attributed to Lomonosov today, namely his history book, was not written by Lomonosov but by someone else. The difference in the invariant values of 20-21 and 24-27 is beyond the acceptable range for fluctuations within the same author's text. This had never happened with other authors examined in the experiment, which numbered in the dozens. This situation is clearly unique, striking, and very suspicious. Even more remarkable is that the author's invariant of Ancient Russian History of 24 and 27% is very close to Müller's author's invariant, which is 28%. Even if the text of Ancient Russian History was originally written by Lomonosov, it

is likely that Müller significantly altered it. Historians can argue that the closeness of Müller's author’s invariant to the invariant of the text of Ancient Russian History proves nothing. And indeed, Fomenko and Nosovsky in their works provide several examples when the author’s invariants of different authors are very similar, such as the invariants of Tolstoy and Turgenev. However, these writers were never uncompromising opponents and never claimed each other's archives. Müller, as we know, fought against Lomonosov for many years, and his methods of fighting often went beyond scientific discussions. We can make a fairly confident assumption that today, under the name of Lomonosov, we have not his text, but a certain book that came out of the kitchen of Müller-Schlözer. This is a distorted version that has been edited, and regrettably, we cannot trust it. Unfortunately, we do not know what Lomonosov actually wrote in his History, since no traces of the original of this History have reached us. When in the 19th century the Romanovs decided to canonize their version of Russian history, the absence of Lomonosov's manuscript of ancient Russian history turned out to be very convenient. The composition of Russian history, which was started by foreign historians, was completed by the Russian historian Nikolay Karamzin. Until the 19th century, only a small circle of people knew the version of Russian history that is widely accepted today. However, after the publication of Karamzin's work, History of the Russian State in 1826, this version became widely known. Gradually, it was canonized and introduced into the school history curriculum. To this day, this so-called official historical version dominates the pages of all textbooks. This fabrication has been repeatedly instilled in the minds of each new generation for almost 200 years. However, immediately after the publication of Karamzin's History, his work was sharply criticized by all Orthodox and patriotically-minded people in Russia. For example, among the critics of this work were Metropolitan Philaret and Admiral Alexander Semyonovich Shishkov. Researchers of Karamzin's works noted that he was too consumer-oriented towards the written documents he used in writing his History. He only took those fragments of texts that corresponded to his narrative and categorically rejected anything that contradicted it. And the Russian historian and writer Nikolai Artsybashev proved the unreliability of one of the main documents used by Karamzin. This is the so-called writing of Prince Kurbsky, History of the Grand Prince of Moscow. Therefore, many noted that Karamzin's works are more of a literary work than an impartial historical analysis. And indeed, Karamzin can hardly be considered an impartial historian. The fact is that Karamzin, who was given the title of official historian of the Russian state, hated Russia and despised everything Russian. At the age of 18, he joined the Masons and became a member of the Golden Crown Masonic Lodge. His Russophobia was manifested in relation to old Russian customs and moral principles of the Russian people. In his Letters of a Russian Traveler, Karamzin wrote: The purely national is nothing next to the all-human. The main thing is to be human beings, not Slavs. For his works on the official Russian history composition, Karamzin was generously rewarded by Nicholas I. He was granted a pension of 50,000 rubles per year. Furthermore, after his death, the same amount was to be paid to his widow, and after her death, to his children, sons until they entered service and daughters until they got married. It is with these kinds of enormous sums that the Romanovs paid their courtly writer of Russian history. Karamzin even had two monuments erected in his honor. One in his hometown of Simbirsk, now Ulyanovsk, and the other in the village of Ostafyevo, where Karamzin wrote his History of the Russian State. It should be noted that both monuments look quite unusual. On the pedestal of the Ulyanovsk monument is featured not the figure of Karamzin, but a statue of the goddess of history, Clio, while the Ostafyevo monument prominently displays the seven volumes of the History of the

Russian State. It seems that the Romanovs erected monuments not to the historian himself, but to the version of history he wrote on their order. Alexander Dmitrievich Chertkov was a Russian historian and archaeologist who spent many years studying Russian history and Slavic antiquities. One of his first works was a description of Russian coins, for which Chertkov was awarded the full Demidov Prize. However, he refused the prize, directing all the money towards the publication of the Ostromir Gospel. He inherited a large library from his parents, which he constantly supplemented with works on Russia and Slavic culture. In 1838, Chertkov published the first volume of the catalog of his library, which was called the General Library of Russia, or the Catalog of books for studying our homeland in all respects and details. Seven years later, the second volume of the catalog appeared. Before the formation of the department of Russian history in the Imperial Public Library, Chertkov's library was the only valuable collection of books about Russia and the Slavs in Russia. Chertkov accompanied the description of his catalog with brief comments. Reading them, one can get an idea of what historians of the 18th and 19th centuries wrote about Russia. For example, one Italian author wrote that Macedonians, Thracians, ancient inhabitants of Illyria, as well as Dacians and Getae were Slavs. That in the 16th century, Novgorod was larger than Rome, and many Roman emperors were of Slavic blood. Can you read something like this in history textbooks today? Chertkov also wrote that more than 25 books, published in Germany from 1575 to 1842, reported that Germany was once inhabited by Slavs. It was they who built Leipzig, Dolich, Rochlitz, Dresden and some other German cities. Later, all these numerous books and testimonies were removed from circulation as a result of the work of the historians of the Müller School. Egor Ivanovich Klassen was a teacher, author of scientific and educational books and textbooks, and a Russian nobleman of German origin. In 1831, he became the curator of the Moscow Practical Academy of Commercial Sciences. He held a doctorate in philosophy and a master's degree in fine arts, and was a State Councillor. He translated and published the historical work of Tadeusz Wolański, Description of Monuments Explaining Slavic-Russian History accompanied by an extensive preface and commentary. All these materials were included in his book with the lengthy title, New Materials for the Ancient History of Slavs in General and Slavic-Rus People Before the Rurik Dynasty, with a Light Sketch of Russian History Before the Birth of Christ. In this book, Klassen wrote that numerous facts of ancient Russian history had long been ignored and simply overlooked. However, these facts indicated that traces of Russian culture were distinctly visible in the daily life and culture of all European peoples. Despite being of German descent, Klassen stated that many German historians had dealt with Russian history extremely dishonestly. He considered Bayer, Müller, and Schlözer among these dishonest historians. Klassen wrote: They adopted everything characteristic Russian to their own people and even attempted to take away not only the glory but even the peoples' name of the Slavic-Rus People, the name Rus, known from ancient times as Slavic, not only to all Asian peoples but also to the Israelites since their arrival in the Promised Land. And among them, the Rus People stand at the forefront not only of the Romans but also of the ancient Greeks, their ancestors... We know that history should not be a panegyric, but we cannot allow them to turn Russian history into satire. Perhaps, it could not be said any better. Addressing Russian historians such as Karamzin, Dombrovsky, and others, Klassen expressed his bewilderment: Let them, with their hand on their hearts, say why they strive to promote Schlözer's version and stigmatize the ancient Slavs. Following Klassen, one would like to ask contemporary historians why they still promote the Schlözer system and why there is no place for the research of Egor Klassen in history textbooks? Ivan Yegorovich Zabelin was a Russian historian and

archaeologist. Since 1837, he served in the Palace Administration of the Moscow Kremlin, working in the archives of the Armory Chamber and the Moscow Palace Office. Within two years, Zabelin realized that he had come across a true treasure. He had in his hands numerous intriguing materials about Moscow Russia that were unknown to anyone else. All his free time not occupied by his official duties, he devoted to archival research. Zabelin published his first work at the age of 22, and by the time he was 30, he had already authored 40 works. During this period, Zabelin began to have doubts about the reliability of the official version of Russian history written by Karamzin. Later, he recalled being astonished that thousands of documents from the 16th and 17th centuries, kept in the Kremlin storage, were not utilized in Karamzin's multi-volume History. As a mature 40-year-old, Zabelin embarked on a new endeavor, archaeology. Engaging in excavations, he frequently encountered situations where the discoveries contradicted the Scaliger-Müller version of history. Over many years of work, Zabelin collected and studied an enormous amount of historical material, which he captivatingly presented in his books such as The History of Russian Life since Ancient Times, History of the City of Moscow, and The Domestic Life of Russian Tsars. Zabelin published around 250 works, including more than ten fundamental monographs. He spent many years amassing a vast library, so extensive that it was utilized by students at Moscow University. Starting from 1885, Zabelin served as the deputy chairman of the State Historical Museum, a position that remained tied to him until the end of his life. Zabelin's personal archive is stored in the Department of Written Sources of the State Historical Museum, consisting of 1,293 folders of documents. Therefore, today it can be confidently stated that the official version of Russian history was invented no earlier than the 18th century, during the reigns of Peter the Great, Anna Ioannovna, and Elizabeth Petrovna. When crafting this version, only those historical materials were used that aligned with the task set before the historians, to create a Russian history that was favorable to the ruling Romanov dynasty. The written sources that form the basis of official Russian history often do not represent original documents. Some documents were carefully edited, while others were simply falsified. The emergence of these documents dates back to the 17th and 18th centuries. It is evident that this historical version is not only erroneous but also harmful because a false understanding of history hinders the people from objectively assessing their past and making the right choices for the future. As is known, the history of any state is based on written documents, primarily chronicles. The most ancient Russian chronicle recognized by historians is the Radziwiłł Chronicle. It is this chronicle that formed the basis of the traditional version of ancient Russian history. However, upon careful examination of this ancient document, it becomes apparent that not only the age of the Radziwiłł Chronicle but also its significance for Russian history has been exaggerated. You can learn more about this in our next part, Radziwiłł Chronicle. Calling of the Varangians.

## Radziwiłł Chronicle

As is known, the history of any state is primarily based on written documents. The oldest among them are chronicles, which are annual-based accounts of events. Chronicles are also called annals or codices. Unfortunately, all the major Russian chronicles that have survived to this day are not original sources. They are scribal copies, which means they are texts copied from some more ancient manuscripts that have not been preserved. Therefore, historians refer to them as both

chronicles and scribal copies when discussing a particular chronicle. Among the Russian chronicles, the main ones are considered to be the Laurentian Codex, the Hypatian Codex, the Novgorod Chronicle, and the Chronicles of Pereyaslavl of Suzdal Monastery. However, historians consider the Radziwiłł Chronicle to be the oldest Russian chronicle that has survived to this day. It is this chronicle that forms the basis of the traditional version of ancient Russian history. It is believed that the Radziwiłł Chronicle appeared in the 15th century. This unique monument of Russian literature contains over 600 colorful miniatures. Based on the study of these drawings, scholars have concluded that the Radziwiłł Chronicle is a copy of some earlier chronicle, most likely the Smolensk one, the original of which has not been preserved. The foundation of the Radziwiłł Chronicle is the so-called Nestor's Chronicle, also known as The Tale of Bygone Years. It tells about historical events from biblical times to the beginning of the 12th century. Despite historians dating the Radziwiłł Chronicle to the 15th century, its history can only be traced back to the 18th century. Upon careful examination, it becomes evident that not only its age but also its significance for Russian history has been exaggerated. It is believed that the first mention of the Radziwiłł Chronicle is associated with the name of Stanisław Zenowicz, who presented it to the Vilnius governor Janusz Radziwiłł. Janusz's son, Bogusław Radziwiłł, allegedly transferred it to the Königsberg Library in 1671. This is how the chronicle acquired its second name, the Königsberg Chronicle. In 1715, Peter the Great passed through Königsberg, where he saw the chronicle and requested a copy for himself. In the same year, a copy was made and sent to Peter. This copy was studied by Tatishchev and later by Lomonosov. In 1758, during the Seven Years' War between Russia and Prussia, Königsberg was occupied by Russian troops, who discovered the original chronicle. In 1761, it was brought to St. Petersburg, to the library of the Russian Academy of Sciences, where the chronicle is kept to this day. Once in the library, the chronicle fell into the hands of August Schlözer, who believed that all written documents, especially chronicles, needed to undergo preliminary critical processing for the writing of Russian history. This meant keeping some parts, correcting others, and even discarding some. Schlözer began preparing an edition of the Radziwiłł Chronicle, but not for Russian readers, rather for German readers. Surprisingly, the Radziwiłł Chronicle was first published in Germany in the German language. According to historical documents, there were supposed preparations for a Russian edition of the chronicle, but for some reason, it never materialized. And all the prepared materials that Lomonosov had been working on, perished in a fire in 1812. In general, the history of the publication of the Radziwiłł Chronicle looks very strange. A worthy edition of the oldest and, as historians say, the most unique Russian chronicle, only appeared at the end of the 20th century. Prior to that, the chronicle was published in 1767, not from the original, but from a copy made for Peter the Great back in 1715. However, compared to the original, the copy contained many inaccuracies and discrepancies. Moreover, when preparing the publication of the Radziwiłł Chronicle, even more errors were introduced into the text than when making the copy. Therefore, this edition could not be considered scholarly. The next publication took place only in 1902. The main manuscript was published using photomechanical methods, but without transcriptions. It was only in 1989 that the Radziwiłł Chronicle was published as a full-fledged scholarly edition as part of the complete collection of Russian chronicles. In 1995, a beautiful facsimile copy of the chronicle was released. It was an important scholarly event. Interestingly, under the pretext of publication, the Radziwiłł Chronicle ended up in private hands several times. This history is quite obscure. It is unclear why, but it transitioned from the library of the Academy of Sciences to the personal possession of secret advisor Muravyov. After his death, it ended up with the renowned

archaeographer and director of the Imperial Public Library, Olenin. When Alexander Ivanovich Ermolaev, who served as a manuscript curator in the same library, prepared the chronicle for publication, the Academy of Sciences demanded that Olenin return the Radziwiłł Chronicle. However, Olenin categorically refused to do so. The reason for his refusal is intriguing. He stated that another edition of the chronicle needed to be prepared. It should be in color, not black and white, and therefore more expensive. He demanded three thousand rubles from the Academy of Sciences for the publication of the manuscript with color illustrations. Olenin received the money from the Academy but never published the chronicle. The true reason why the publication of the chronicle never took place is unknown. When the new president of the Academy of Sciences, Count Uvarov, inquired about it in 1818, the academicians responded that the Academy was not at fault, and the delay in the publication was due to Mr. Olenin's numerous engagements. In other words, the director of the Imperial Library was very occupied and had no time for explanations. However, for some reason, they were completely unconcerned that such a unique document remained in private hands for so long, without any supervision. The library of the Academy of Sciences was created primarily for the needs of academic scholars. For example, the acquisition of our collections was largely oriented towards the needs of academic science. Therefore, it is not surprising that materials required for the work of a particular historian, in this case, were issued to them for home use. This was a normal practice in the 18th and 19th centuries. In the end, the Radziwiłł Chronicle did return to the library of the Academy of Sciences. But what was done with it while it changed hands can only be speculated upon today. However, we will try to figure it out. After the publication of the Academic Description of the Chronicle and the release of the facsimile, a wide circle of researchers and historians could finally become acquainted with the Radziwiłł Chronicle. Among them were Russian scholars Anatoly Fomenko and Gleb Nosovsky, the authors of the New Chronology. They thoroughly studied the description first, and then the facsimile images of the pages, and came to an unexpected conclusion: the Radziwiłł Chronicle is not a written artifact of the 15th century. No one before us analyzed the pages of the chronicle so attentively and meticulously. All the researchers who have worked with this text until now believed that they were dealing with an authentic ancient text. Unfortunately, they were mistaken. They overlooked clear signs of forgery, which became visible only from the perspective of the New Chronology. We cannot understand why the historians themselves, who compiled this description, did not pay attention to the obvious signs of forgery and tampering in the Radziwiłł Chronicle. Our only explanation is that they probably noticed it but either did not have the strength or were afraid to speak out about it. Until 1995, the Radziwiłł Chronicle was kept in this binding. When the decision was made to release a facsimile edition of the chronicle, it was unbound. After the release of the facsimile, the chronicle was restored, and the lost paper fragments were reconstructed. After the restoration, the size of the bookblock increased, and the old cover turned out to be too small. For several years, specialists debated whether to return the chronicle to its old binding or create a new one. In the end, in 2002, a new binding was made, and the old covers are now stored separately from the chronicle. Unfortunately, the new binding obscured some details of the chronicle, which are referenced in the research of Fomenko and Nosovsky. However, these details are present in the academic description of the chronicle, which we will also use. Therefore, this unique manuscript consists of 32 signatures. Initially, each signature had 4 folded pieces of paper, resulting in 8 leaves in each signature. However, what is unclear is that the number of leaves in each signature is even, but the total number of leaves in the manuscript is odd, specifically 251 leaves. Does this mean that one of the leaves was lost or,

conversely, added later? Upon careful examination of the chronicle, it is clearly visible that the first and last leaves are in place. This means that the missing leaf was located inside the chronicle. Consequently, one of the leaves lacks a pair, and there should be a meaningful gap in the text. Let's try to figure out where in the manuscript this mysterious place with the unpaired leaf is located. Let's turn to the Academic Description of the Chronicle. It states that signatures 3 to 28 contain 8 leaves each. All the double leaves in them are intact and not torn. This means that these signatures do not raise any suspicions. However, when it comes to the first and second signatures, the picture is completely different. Firstly, the first signature consists of 6 leaves, meaning it is reduced by 2 leaves. But after it, almost until the end of the manuscript, standard 8-leaf signatures follow. So, where did the two leaves from the first signature go? Secondly, all the double leaves in the first two signatures were torn in half; pages were separated and did not go into the fold of the signature. Most likely, somewhere here is where the unpaired leaf is located. This can be verified as follows. In the Radziwiłł Chronicle, leaves are numbered in two ways: with Church Slavonic letters and Arabic numerals. The letter “A” corresponds to the numeral 1, “V” corresponds to 2, “G” corresponds to 3, and so on. The numbering with Slavonic letters is placed in the lower right corner of the page, while the numbering with numerals is placed in the upper right corner. In the past, not only leaves but signatures were also numbered. The first page of each signature was assigned its number. The numbers of the signatures are indicated only with letters. Unfortunately, during the binding of the manuscript, a large part of these markings was cut off. The first preserved signature number, which corresponds to Church Slavonic letter “E”, is on the 33rd leaf. The second preserved signature number, 9, is on the 65th leaf, and so on. Therefore, in all signatures, including the first one, there were originally 8 leaves because the last leaf of each signature, 32, 64, was a multiple of eight. Now let's take a close look at the pages of the first two signatures. On the first seven leaves, the numbering is either absent or done in different styles. It is evident that the numbers were written at different times and by different people. The entire text of this part of the chronicle is composed of separate, loosely connected fragments. Logical discontinuities, repetitions, and different terminology indicate edits made at some point. And it is precisely on these pages that the earliest history of Russia is described — the origin of Slavic tribes, the founding of Novgorod and Kiev. Now let's examine the condition of the script of Arabic numerals and Church Slavonic letters. Here are three leaves: the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth. It is quite obvious that the numbers were corrected and increased by one. The tenth number was made from the ninth. For this, the letter “Fita” was replaced with the letter “E”. Correcting the Church Slavonic number ten to eleven was not a big challenge at all. They simply added the letter “A” next to the letter “E”. The alteration is particularly clear on the twelfth leaf. In Church Slavonic, twelve is written as “V”. But it can be seen that initially, it was written as “AE”, meaning eleven. The two strokes added to the letter “A” made it resemble “V”. This alteration is so crude that it is impossible not to notice it. But there was a genuine, unaltered twelfth leaf in the chronicle. Where is it? Most likely, it was simply torn out. This is where the text has a logical gap. The thirteenth leaf starts a new sentence. This is clearly visible. There is a large red cinnabar letter at the beginning of the sentence, and the previous sentence, supposedly on the twelfth leaf, is incomplete. The period at the end of this sentence does not signify its completion. In the past, a period was written as a triangle made up of three dots, and a single dot represented a comma. All these manipulations with the leaves were done to make room for the leaf with Church Slavonic number nine. It is from this point in the chronicle that the numerical and alphabetical page numbering diverges. This is the leaf with Arabic number eight and

Slavonic number nine. Even a quick glance is enough to see it. The leaf was not part of a whole spread. Its corners are torn and worn. So why was space freed up for this leaf? What is written on it? It is precisely on this leaf with Arabic number eight and Church Slavonic number nine that the famous story of the calling of the Varangians to Russia is told. This story forms the basis of the renowned Norman theory proposed by Bayer, Müller, and Schlözer regarding the origin of the Russian state. According to this theory, Kievan Russia was established by Scandinavians, Swedish Vikings. They allegedly subjugated the East Slavic tribes and became the ruling class among them. The Norman legend states that supposedly in the year 6370 (from Adam), the Slavic tribes refused to pay tribute to the Varangians and set out to govern themselves. There was no law among them, but tribe rose against tribe, and they began to war one against another. They said to themselves, let us seek a prince who may rule over us and judge us according to the Law. They accordingly went overseas to the Varangian Russes. The Chuds, the Slavs, the Krivichians then said to the people of Rus, Our land is great and rich, but there is no order in it. Come to rule and reign over us. They thus selected three brothers, with their kinsfolk, who took with them all the Russes and came to the Slovenes. The oldest, Rurik, built the city of Ladoga and located himself in Ladoga; the second, Sineus, at Beloozero; and the third, Truvor, in Izborsk. On account of those Varangians, the land became known as the Russian land. But if we could remove this page, how would the narrative of the chronicle change? After all, it is only on this inserted leaf that the city of Ladoga and Lake Ladoga are mentioned as landmarks of the location of Rurik's first capital, somewhere amidst the swamps of the Pskov region. Since we cannot remove the leaf, let's simply ignore it. And then Rurik becomes just a Russian prince, specifically from Rostov, rather than Scandinavian. Russian chronicles contain many stories about the calling of princes to rule in one city or another. At that time, it was a common practice in Russia. Moreover, if the citizens called someone to rule as prince, it did not mean that they fully surrendered themselves to the new rulers. Princes were merely hired for service, and if the residents of a city were dissatisfied with a prince's performance, they would simply expel him and replace him with another. Many examples of such cases can be found, for instance, in the Illustrated Chronicle of Ivan the Terrible. They all indicate that the rulers of cities were chosen from their own princes, not foreigners. Therefore, the calling of strangers, supposedly Scandinavian princes is a unique case in Russian history. Even Nikolai Karamzin, who never disputed the Norman theory, wrote with bewilderment in his History of the Russian State: The beginning of Russian history presents us with an amazing and perhaps unparalleled case in chronicles. The Slavs voluntarily destroy their ancient rule and demand Sovereigns from the Varangians, who were their enemies. Everywhere, the sword of the mighty or the cunning of the ambitious introduced autocracy. In Russia, it was established with the general consent of the citizens. Indeed, this is a remarkable case because Russians have had a special, sacred relationship with their homeland from time immemorial. Practically all surviving ancient documents speak of the highest and most sacred duty in Russia being the defense of one's homeland. Russians surrender themselves to the rule of an enemy who did not even attack them, only on this page of the Tale of Bygone Years. Moreover, according to the Norman theory, Slavs received not only statehood from foreign princes but even their own name, Rus. The absurdity of this claim was already demonstrated in the 19th century by the Russian scholar and historian Egor Ivanovich Klassen, who accused the authors of the Norman theory, Bayer, Müller, and Schlözer, of treating Russian history dishonestly. He wrote: They adopted everything characteristic Russian to their own people and even attempted to take away not only the glory, greatness, power, wealth, industry, trade, and all the good qualities

of their hearts but even the peoples' name of the Slavic-Rus People, the name Rus, known from ancient times as Slavic, not only to all Asian peoples but also to the Israelites since their arrival in the Promised Land. And yet, based on one pasted, shabby leaf of paper, the theory that Russians were incapable of statehood has persisted for 300 years. Relying on this theory, not only Western but also domestic Russian scholars, Karamzin, Klyuchevsky, Solovyov, year after year, century after century, instilled in the Russian people an inferiority complex, accustomed them to the idea of a secondary place in world history. For several centuries, the Norman theory was considered the only correct one. And the main argument for its infallibility was just a few lines from the Tale of Bygone Years. But the forgeries in the Radziwiłł Chronicle do not end there. By inserting one leaf into the chronicle, the forgers prepared a place for another forged leaf. On the Norman page of the Radziwiłł Chronicle, there is an interesting note. Not the eighth leaf, but the ninth should be counted, because there is a missing leaf before this. That is, supposedly, there was another leaf before the Norman leaf. If the leaf is lost, then there should be a gap in the text. Let's see. The seventh leaf in the chronicle is well-preserved, but the top of the next leaf is damaged, and some fragments of the text are lost. However, it was possible to reconstruct it from other chronicles that included the Tale of Bygone Years. So, here is how this text sounds: Then the Khazars came upon them as they lived in the hills and forests, and demanded tribute from them. After consulting among themselves, the Polyanians paid as tribute one sword per hearth. The Bulgarians, upon seeing that they could offer no resistance, asked to be baptized and to submit themselves to the Greeks. The Tsar baptized their prince with all his boyars, and made peace with the Bulgarians. Where is the semantic gap here? Moreover, the previous page ends with a period, and this page begins with a capital red letter. It is quite obvious that there are no omissions or breaks in this text. It is a complete, coherent thought. But nonetheless, someone's accommodating hand wrote that a leaf was missing exactly here. And, certainly, it was found, and by none other than Schlözer. Since then, the contents of this newly found leaf have been included in all editions of the Tale of Bygone Years, except for photocopies, because the original chronicle does not contain this leaf. Strangely enough, the miraculously discovered by Schlözer leaf was not returned to its supposedly rightful place. What was written on this supposedly found leaf? It turns out that it was nothing less than a chronology of ancient Russian history and its connection to world chronology. The entire chronology of Kievan Rus is presented, with references to Byzantine and Roman chronology. Without this page, Russian chronology hangs in the air and loses its connection to world Scaligerian history. But where is this leaf itself? Why wasn't it included in the chronicle, just like the Norman one? Whoever wrote this supposedly lost leaf understood perfectly well how important it is for constructing the chronology of Russian history. That's why they treated this leaf more seriously than the Norman one. The Norman leaf was simply crudely glued in, hoping for the Romanovs to figure out where their Rurik came from. That's their local history. But chronology is a completely different matter because the falsified Russian chronology was part of a global falsification of history. Schlözer and his colleagues were well aware of this. In the 18th century, they still remembered the price at which the fake Scaligerian history and chronology were introduced. That's why they didn't rush to paste in the chronological leaf. The forgery would have been too obvious. A new edition of the chronicle was needed, a new scribal copy in which this leaf seemed to have been there from the beginning. With the help of a cunning note in the margins saying, here a leaf is lost, they only prepared a placeholder for it. Perhaps it was for this purpose that a copy of the Radziwiłł Chronicle was made, the so-called Moscow-Academic Chronicle or the Trinity-Sergius copy, in which this

lost leaf was already present, and no one noticed the insert. However, it is possible that the falsifiers did not limit themselves to forging only a few pages. It is quite possible that the entire Radziwiłł Chronicle was written not in the 15th century but in the 18th century. Historians say that the watermark on the paper indicates the time of the chronicle's creation. It is clearly visible that the watermark is in the shape of a bull's head. It is believed that such watermarks were only made in the 15th century. However, unfortunately, dating a manuscript based on watermarks is not absolute. The compilers of the chronicle could have used paper supplies made two centuries ago. As is known, paper can be stored for more than a century under good conditions. Specialists refer to this as the storing or ageing of paper. I have encountered cases of paper ageing for up to 40 years. According to colleagues, they encountered much longer periods that can be measured in centuries. But I'm not even talking about cases of falsification, when, for example, old paper is used to write manuscripts 200-300 years later. Such cases also happen. Moreover, the watermark itself could have been used by a paper mill in the 15th, 16th, and 17th centuries. Furthermore, several pages from the binding and the old binding itself are dated precisely to the 18th century, also based on watermarks. Interestingly, all editions of The Tale of Bygone Years known today are also written on paper with the watermark of a bull's head or its variations. Miniatures also speak to the fact that the dating of the Radziwiłł Chronicle should not be tied to the paper. In 1958, an important step was taken in the study of the Radziwiłł Chronicle. Art historian Olga Ilinichna Podobedova examined and photographed the illustrations under ultraviolet and infrared rays. It turned out that all the multi-figure compositions consisted of at least three layers of revisions made by different artists at different times. Moreover, each artist changed the positions of the figures, redrew faces, added new weapons, princely hats, crowns, and changed clothing. But that's not all. Podobedova concluded that the second artist worked on the drawings shortly after the first, while the third artist worked on them a considerable time later. Thus, art historian Podobedova made a very important discovery. The work on the illustrations continued much longer than was previously thought. The Tale of Bygone Years is the main text of the Hypatian Chronicle, the Laurentian Chronicle, and the Troitsko-Sergievsky Chronicle. Interestingly, they were discovered in different, quite distant locations from each other: in Königsberg, Suzdal, and the Moscow Governorate. According to historians, these chronicles were written at different times and by completely different people. However, the main text of the chronicle, that is, the text of the Tale of Bygone Years, is almost identical. It only differs in minor stylistic edits. Historians do not find this surprising since all these manuscripts are based on the same Nestor's copy. But if the Laurentian, Hypatian, and Troitsko-Sergievsky chronicles are copies of the same ancient original, then it is unclear how this original spread over such a great distance from Königsberg to the Vladimir Governorate. It was not an easy task to accomplish at that time. And why was so little of the original text modified? After all, the scribes worked independently of each other. Most likely, all these copies, the Laurentian, Hypatian, and Troitsko-Sergievsky, were made using a copy of the Radziwiłł Chronicle, published in 1767, and created in the same place. And only later were they supposedly accidentally discovered by diligent antiquarians like Musin-Pushkin and Karamzin. In order to have more evidence for the falsified version of ancient Russian history, it needed to be widely replicated. It is likely that additional chronicles were created for this purpose. This version is indirectly supported by the following fact: there is not a word about the Norman origin of the summoned princes in such a monumental artifact of ancient Russian book art as the Illustrated Chronicle of Ivan the Terrible. And yet, in terms of large scale and breadth of coverage of historical events, this document has no

analogues in the world. The Illustrated Chronicle is a document from the 16th century that fully and extensively presents the concept of Russian statehood and its direct connection with Orthodoxy. It is possible that in this document, the Illustrated Chronicle, the authors reflected the concept of Russia's historical destiny from ancient times to the time of Ivan Vasilyevich. The emphasis on the country's history and the vision of educated Russian scribes of the 16th century are set forth here. There is no place for the Norman theory. And indeed, in the text of this multivolume chronograph, consisting of ten volumes, there is only one mention of the calling of Rurik and his brothers. Not a word is said about their foreign origin. For we are descended from those great princes, from our first great prince Rurik, whom our land willingly took from the Varangians as its ruler with his two brothers. Then his great-grandson, the Grand Prince Vladimir, was baptized, and he baptized all our lands... It is not stated from which locality the princes came, but it is said that they were from the Varangians. Supporters of the Norman theory still associate the term Varangians with Scandinavian Vikings. Although many chronicles Russian, Greek, and Western European, speak of the Varangians as not being a people but a special military caste. As Egor Ivanovich Klassen wrote, they were hired as auxiliary troops and served the same purpose in trade routes, protecting merchant vessels from attacks, in the seas from sea robbers, and on rivers from river robbers. Among the Varangians were people of different nationalities, including Russians. After examining the Radziwiłł Chronicle, the impression of something counterfeit and unreal is left not only by the pasted and mixed-up pages but also by the artistic design of the chronicle. Many drawings are unfinished or very roughly done. It gives the impression that the artists were trying to depict a style that they were not familiar with and they were working in great haste. This is indicated by the incompleteness of the Radziwiłł Chronicle. It lacks the imprint, that is, the initial miniature. There is no mandatory concluding colophon that should state where, when, by whom, and at whose behest this book was written. From leaf 108 to the end of the chronicle, excluding only leaf 118, the cinnabar letters, that is, the capital letters written in red ink, are not added. It is as if the work was interrupted in the midst of it and was never returned to. Although such negligence is completely atypical for the compilation of illustrated chronicles. Most often, such chronicles were commissioned by very wealthy and influential individuals who would not tolerate shoddy work. Why, then, was the production of the Radziwiłł Chronicle treated so carelessly? And why were they in such a hurry? Finding precise answers to these questions is quite difficult. Perhaps future researchers will be able to uncover all the secrets of the Radziwiłł Chronicle. But today, we can confidently say that in the 18th century, the discovery of the so-called ancient chronicles had tremendous significance. Although the writing of Russian history began during the reign of the early Romanovs, until the Radziwiłł Chronicle, the new historical version was merely a court theory without serious documentary evidence. But after its discovery, the Romanovs finally had a document, a primary source, which supposedly served as a scientific foundation for the theory. This foundation was reinforced exclusively by foreign historians. For the Romanovs, the appearance of the Radziwiłł Chronicle was really necessary. With its help, the Romanov falsifiers justified several forgeries. The first forgery is the calling of the princes to Russia from the northwestern lands. It is absolutely clear that this falsification was made in favor of the Romanov dynasty, which originated from the Pskov and Lithuanian lands. Now, no one dared to question the Romanovs' right to the Russian throne. The second forgery involved altering the location of Novgorod the Great. It was moved from the Volga to the Pskov region. The name Novgorod was taken away from the ancient Russian capital of Yaroslavl and given to another city. Along with the previous name, a significant part of the history of Yaroslavl and the Russian

history of the Rurik era disappeared from the pages of history. And the third forgery is, certainly, the chronology of Kievan Rus, which, thanks to the Radziwiłł Chronicle, was tied to the new Scaligerian chronology. For decades, the Norman theory of the origin of Russia was considered absolutely accurate and infallible. Despite the fact that the authors of this theory were German historians, for a long time, the most fervent supporters of this theory were not European historians but Russian ones. In the 18th and 19th centuries, Western European historiographers, for sure, acknowledged that ancient Russia was founded by Scandinavians, but they did not specifically delve into this issue. However, Russian Normanists vigorously argued for their people's slave origin. For one and a half centuries, Romanov historians stood guard over the Norman theory. Following Müller and Schlözer were Karamzin, Solovyov, and Klyuchevsky. The confrontation between the Normanists and anti-Normanists lasted for over two hundred years. Until 1917, the Norman theory and the version of Russian history based on it were the official historical version of the ruling dynasty. But after the fall of the Romanov dynasty, the need for this theory disappeared. In the 1920s, attitudes towards the Norman theory began to change in Russian historical science, and gradually it transformed from a scientific theory into an unscientific one. It seems that Russian historians were finally able to impartially examine the Radziwiłł Chronicle and see that, indeed, a page with the Norman theory was glued in. It is not surprising that this fact was carefully concealed during the Romanov era. Only a narrow circle of people had access to the chronicle. If the Slavophiles of the 19th century had learned that the foundation of the infamous Norman theory, against which they fiercely fought, was just a dubious glued-in page, it would have caused such an uproar in not only scholarly circles but throughout Russian society, with uncertain consequences. The historical concepts that have entered modern textbooks were formed in a certain era, based on the knowledge available at that time. Now, new sources have emerged, and there are all the prerequisites for conducting new work, making new discoveries, and, as in any field of science, moving forward. Today, the Radziwiłł Chronicle is published as part of the complete collection of Russian chronicles and as a separate colorful edition. So now anyone interested can see on what the Norman theory was based. There is a common belief that over time, many significant historical events gradually fade from collective memory. Therefore, after centuries, it is practically impossible to reconstruct authentic information about them. However, in world history, there are many examples of the memory of events from long-gone days living on after several centuries. And if information about certain historical facts has not been preserved, the reason lies not in the forgetfulness of new generations but in something else entirely. Unfortunately, throughout the history of humanity, individuals have emerged in various eras who distorted history, not only of their own people but also the history of humanity as a whole, substituting genuine facts with blatant fiction, all to serve their caste and personal interests. The most vivid example of this is the events that took place in Europe during the 16th and 17th centuries. You can learn more about it in our next part, Reformation. The Dissolution of the Empire.

## Reformation. The Dissolution of the Empire

During the 16th and 17th centuries, in the era when the traditional version of history was created, primarily by authors such as Joseph Scaliger and Dionysius Petavius, historians invented numerous

empires that supposedly existed at different times and among various peoples. However, extensive research indicates that throughout the entirety of human history, there was only one world empire, the Russia-Horde Empire. This is how it is referred to by the authors of the New Chronology, Anatoly Fomenko and Gleb Nosovsky. Nevertheless, supporters of the traditional historical school object to this notion. If such an empire had truly existed, its fall would have been a global event of its time, which could not have been overlooked in the chronicles. However, neither Russian nor European documents allegedly mention such an event. In reality, this is not the case. The collapse of the Russia-Horde Empire is described in great detail in history. It is just known by a different name, the European Reformation. The Reformation is the commonly used term for the religious and social movement that began in the 16th century and spread across Western Europe. The Reformation ideologically prepared the ground for revolutions, fostered a distinct type of human personality, formulated the foundations of new morality, religion, and philosophy. The Reformation left a profound impact on world history and had a global, pan-European character. It is considered that the process of the Reformation has been well-studied. Historians have at their disposal numerous documents from that time, such as the Edict of Nantes of 1598, the Index of Prohibited Books by Pope Paul III, the works of the founders of Protestantism Martin Luther, John Calvin, literary works by Erasmus of Rotterdam, and others. However, despite this, many of our contemporaries know very little about it. Starting from the 16th century, the term Reformation began to be primarily used in relation to the religious changes of that time, the conflict between Catholics and Protestants. However, as early as the 15th century, this word was applied to any social and state transformations. For example, we know about the Reformatio Sigismundi or the Reformation of Frederick III in Germany. So, let us try to figure out what the Reformation really was about. Let us recall what modern textbooks and encyclopedias tell us about the events of the Reformation era. The first uprisings flared up in territories that now belong to Germany, Switzerland, and the Netherlands. In the 16th century, these countries consisted of small principalities and free cities. It was precisely there that the Reformation had the greatest success. As a result, in 1581, the Netherlands declared their independence from the Holy Roman Empire. In Germany, the victory of the Reformation led to the strengthening of local princely power and, consequently, to even greater political and economic fragmentation. The lands of modern Italy largely fell under the rule of Spain from 1494 to 1559. Portugal achieved independence from Spain in 1640 when Spain was at war with almost everyone. Spain occasionally achieved local victories and annexed new territories but ultimately lost everywhere. In the 16th and 17th centuries there was a change of many royal dynasties in Europe. For example, in England, the Tudor dynasty was succeeded by the Stuarts. In France, the Valois dynasty was overthrown by the Bourbons. In Russia, after many years of the Time of Troubles, the ruling Rurik dynasty came to an end, and in 1613, the Romanovs ascended to the Russian throne. Thus, practically for all European countries, the 16th century was a turning point. Three decades of bloody wars engulfed Europe, with the participation of practically all European countries. This general European military conflict entered history as the Thirty Years' War. This confrontation ended with the signing of the Peace of Westphalia in October 1648, which fundamentally changed the Holy Roman Empire. As a result of the Reformation, profound transformations took place everywhere, far beyond the resolution of purely religious issues. Only in the works of later historians was the meaning of the Reformation artificially narrowed. It turns out that instead of fully and meaningfully depicting historical events, historians deliberately distorted the picture of the past. For what purpose? Let us examine in more detail the reasons for the

Reformation that official history cites. Historians write that at the beginning of the 16th century, European nations showed a desire for national liberation from Rome and its colossal authority over the Church. They spoke at that time about freeing themselves from the yoke of the excessive power of the Antichrist. However, it is highly doubtful that the Italian Rome and its church had any real power in Europe at that time, let alone excessive power. Historians themselves claim that the peak of papal authority was reached in the 13th century under Innocent III, but certainly not in the 16th century. Alister McGrath, a renowned British Christian theologian and theological historian, writes in his book Reformation Thought: An Introduction: A development in the later medieval period which is of central importance to a study of the Reformation is the growing crisis in authority within the Church, evident from the fourteenth century onwards. And indeed, by the beginning of the 16th century, the power and authority of the Pope in many European countries had plummeted to almost zero. Here are a few facts: In Spain, as early as the 15th century, control over the Inquisition court system was transferred from the Pope to the Spanish king. In 1515, the French king Francis I emerged victorious over the combined papal and Swiss forces at the Battle of Marignano. This forced the Pope to grant the French king the right to independently appoint high clergy and thus govern the church and its finances. Furthermore, the Pope was now compelled to consider the interests of the French king in decision-making regarding Italian affairs. The position of the clergy on the local level weakened the authority of the Roman Church as well. Alister McGrath writes: In early sixteenth-century Milan, chaplains had incomes lower than those of unskilled laborers. Many resorted to horse and cattle trading to make ends meet. In rural France during the same period, the clergy enjoyed roughly the same social status as vagabonds: their exemption from taxation, prosecution in civil courts, and compulsory military service apart, they were virtually indistinguishable from other itinerant beggars of the period. So, historians themselves acknowledge that by the beginning of the 16th century, the power and authority of the Roman Catholic Church in political, social, and ecclesiastical spheres were very limited. But then, what excessive power of Rome can we talk about? According to the official version of history, the Reformation movement began with the speech of the German monk and theologian Martin Luther. According to a legend that has no reliable historical confirmation, on the eve of All Saints' Day, October 31, 1517, Luther nailed sheets with the text of his famous Ninety-five Theses to the door of All Saints' Church in Wittenberg. In these theses, the first ideologist of the Reformation spoke out against the papal bull of Pope Leo X on absolution and the sale of indulgences. Later, the father of Protestantism translated the Bible from Latin into German and generally became the founder of the German literary language. Luther's followers, Ulrich Zwingli and John Calvin, continued the reforms more radically. Thus, in Zwinglian churches, icons, statues of saints, bell ringing, and organ music were prohibited. But were rivers of blood really shed during the Reformation because of the violation of Catholic norms, the introduction of a common German literary language, and disputes over whether to allow bell ringing during services? Alister McGrath writes. There was an urgent need to recapture the vitality and freshness of the Christian faith. Many looked back with nostalgia to the simplicity and excitement of the apostolic Christianity of the first century. Could not this Golden Age of the Christian faith be regained, perhaps by pondering anew the New Testament documents? This program of reform was the wistful pipe dream of intellectuals throughout half of Europe. Well, intellectuals usually dream and write books, while those who don't read books are the ones who fight. When a peasant uprising broke out in Germany, Martin Luther, the father of Protestantism, did not support it. He was convinced that the people should submit to the authorities.

Moreover, he angrily attacked the rebels, suggesting that the princes should kill them like mad dogs. We have been taught to think that the Reformation was supposedly a purely religious movement aimed against the papacy, against indulgences, against abuses in the Catholic Church, against certain Catholic rituals, in other words, purely religious activity. In reality, this is not the case at all. The reformers pursued purely political goals; they fought for power, and used religious slogans as a means, as a means of attracting people, as a means of creating turmoil. They played on the religious feelings of the people. This is actually what it is all about. In the modern world, all wars, even those declared as wars for faith, always have a material justification. These holy wars are actually fought for the formation of autonomy or an independent national state. Religion acts as an ideology, as a banner, but in no way as a cause, no matter how much they assure us otherwise. All wars at all times are fought for resources. It is difficult to imagine that in the 16th century the nature of people was fundamentally different. This is well illustrated by the example of the French King Henry of Navarre. He was alternately a Huguenot, then a Catholic, then fled back to the Huguenots. When the path to the French throne opened before him, he, uttering the famous words “Paris is worth a mass,” became a Catholic again. However, historians, in telling their version of the events of the Reformation era, essentially assert that people killed each other for decades over the replacement of the mass with preaching and making the sign of cross with three fingers instead of two. The lack of real motives in such an explanation, scientists try to compensate for by introducing the concept of social passionarity. The renowned historian Lev Gumilev believed that, for example, the Hussite Wars were fought for no reason at all. The Czechs and Germans simply accumulated too much energy, or what he called passionarity, and they began to fight. The most passionate ones killed each other, the level of passionarity naturally decreased, and the wars ceased on their own. Thus, in traditional history, a funny picture emerges. In some cases, people fight for nothing. Moreover, the population of an entire country, in this case Czechia, is reduced by several times. And in other cases, when very serious issues are at stake, everything passes peacefully. While paying tribute to the magnificent erudition of Lev Nikolayevich Gumilev, one cannot help but acknowledge that his theory of passionarity is simply a classic example of a theory invented to explain itself and nothing more. It sounds something like this: Rome fell because its passionarity decreased. And the fact that passionarity decreased is proven by the fact that Rome fell. Lev Nikolayevich Gumilev was an interesting historian. He independently discovered repetitions and sine waves in history. Unfortunately, he did not understand that the chronology of history was mistaken. I remember discussing this topic with him several times and trying to explain to him that the repetitions he discovered were artificial. Unfortunately, he did not agree with this, did not delve into the essence of the matter, and preferred to explain these repetitions by some kind of passionarity. When asked what it was, he never really explained it to me or my colleagues. We believe that this is his mistake. Although he did discover this effect, and it is a very interesting effect. So, historians explain the emergence of the Reformation movement with passionarity, religious fanaticism, and the excessive power of the Pope. They cannot provide any other justification for wars, rebellions, or dynastic changes. But if religious transformations served only as a pretext, and the power of the Pope was ephemeral, then what was the true cause of this pan-European rebellion? Against whom did Europe fight? The New Chronology provides an answer to this question. According to its authors, Europe was a vassal of Russia until the end of the 16th century and regularly paid tribute for several centuries. Within this version, the bloody events of the Reformation acquire a perfectly understandable meaning. Europe was trying to break free from the rule of the Russian emperor and

create its own independent states. In other words, if we substitute the words “Catholic Rome” with Russia and “the Pope” with the Russian Tsar, everything falls into place. So, the Western Europeans were fighting for the national identity and independence of their states, and therefore their national finances, without payments to the central Russia-Horde authority. That is, the reformers pursued quite secular, political, and economic goals, but covered them with the necessity of religious transformations. During the Reformation era, flyers were actively spreading in some Western European countries. The Roman papacy was depicted in a rather repulsive way on them. There was no religious meaning in these flyers, nor a drop of piety. The defeated enemy, who previously inspired awe and fear, was to be ridiculed fiercely and evilly. Daring Western Europe began to call the power of Russia-Horde more and more loudly the empire of Antichrist, the kingdom of pagans, and Babylon. This picture shows the Pope being overthrown to the ground. He holds a document with eight seals in his hands. It looks very similar to the Russian Novgorod charters with exactly so many seals. One can assume that these were imperial decrees that were sent to the regions because European charters look completely different. Are the rebel reformers trampling on a charter of Novgorod the Great? Most likely, this picture depicts a rebellion not against the dogmas of Catholicism, but against the secular authority of imperial Russia. And the Pope being overthrown to the ground is a symbol of the Russian emperor. After all, it was in the 16th century that Moscow became the capital of Russia, which was called the Third Rome. Today it is believed that Moscow took the proud name of the Third Rome as if shyly, without claiming anything special. And Western Europe supposedly tried hard and insincerely to persuade Russia that it really was the Third Rome and had the right to world domination. And, please don’t refuse. That’s what is written in the book Controversial Issues of Domestic History of the XI-XVIII centuries. It cannot be proven that in the Moscow state of the late 15th – early 16th centuries there existed a sense of identity as the heir to the Byzantine Empire in a political sense. However, in the West, attempts were made to instill this idea in the Russian ruler. Thus, documents convey to us a medieval view from Western Europe of Russia as the center of world dominance. For some reason, modern commentators do not like this. Trying to find an explanation for this, they say that the West was trying to flatter Russia. But perhaps such statements were simply an expression of loyal feelings? Old documents that have come down to us from the 14th – 16th centuries show that both in Russia and in Western Europe, the idea that Moscow was the Third Rome was taken seriously and consciously, rather than as some purely ideological or philosophical concept. This is all clear and correct. According to our reconstruction, Moscow in the 16th century was indeed the metropolis of the Russia-Horde and was the Third Rome in the truest sense. This is a genuine fact of medieval history. And the excessive power that the Western Europeans rebelled against at that time was in reality not the power of Italian Rome, but of the Russia-Horde. And the cursed word Rome in those days pointed not at Italy, but at Moscow, the capital of the Russia-Horde. It becomes understandable why ruling dynasties almost everywhere in Europe changed at that time. Here’s how it happened, for example, in Germany. Both the cities and the so-called imperial knighthood were dissatisfied with the princely power. And in the intellectual circles of Germany there were people who dreamed of a complete internal restructuring of the state. The princes were against the emperor. In 1529, at a diet which was held in Speyer, on behalf of Emperor Charles V, it was proposed to restore order. By that time, the emperor had not appeared in his German possessions for about 8 years. The opinions of the participants in the diet were divided. Five princes and representatives of 14 Imperial Free Cities protested. It was from there that the reform movement became known as Protestants. Historians tell

us that the Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire, Charles V of Habsburg, ruled over a gigantic empire known as the empire on which the sun never sets, due to its vast size. It included Spanish America, Naples, Sicily, the Spanish Kingdom, Austrian and German territories. Initially, Charles V successfully fought against Protestant princes in Germany, but in 1555, he is believed to be forced to sign a compromise with them. Reading ancient chronicles, one cannot fail to notice a peculiar feature of Charles V. He was always somewhere far away from Western European countries. From the chronicles, it is not even very clear where his capital was located. He was recognized by all as the supreme ruler, but he remained distant, like in the heavens. Sometimes he appeared in Germany, sometimes in France, but usually his governors acted on his behalf. His departure from the historical scene was also unusual. In 1556, he renounced all his titles and retired to a monastery. Looking at the history of Charles V, one wonders, where was his capital? Sometimes he was in Germany, sometimes in Spain, sometimes he ruled there, sometimes he ruled here. There is no definite place, no definite capital where he constantly resided and from where he ruled his empire. This is impossible. An emperor, a ruler must have a capital. Where is it? According to the proposed version of history, Charles V did not have a specific capital. According to the authors of the New Chronology theory, Western chroniclers described a Russian emperor or his governor in Western Europe under the name of Charles V. We have discovered strange mysterious parallels in medieval and ancient history. It turned out that many ancient dynasties are a reflection of the Russian Horde dynasty of the 13th-17th centuries. In particular, the famous Habsburg dynasty is a reflection of the dynasty of Russian Tsars-Khans. In the Habsburg dynasty, there is a famous emperor Charles V, who turns out to be a reflection of the famous Tsar-Khan Ivan IV the Terrible, Ivan Vasilyevich. In the documents, by the way, there is an indication of where Charles V ruled, that is, Ivan Vasilyevich the Terrible. In Europe, specifically in Austria, or as it was called in those days, Osterreich. But this simply means Eastern Empire. Therefore, everything is indeed correct. Charles V, or Ivan the Terrible, ruled in the Eastern Empire, that is, in the Russia-Horde. Here is the official portrait of Emperor Charles V. He is dressed in luxurious imperial clothing, and he holds a scepter and orb in his hands, as in similar portraits of Russian autocratic rulers. Another fact in European history now receives a rather unexpected justification. The end of the 16th and the beginning of the 17th centuries coincides with the birth of the new sumptuous and elaborate Baroque style. Within the framework of traditional history, its emergence is not connected in any way with political changes in Europe. It is said that such a fashion simply arose. However, the Baroque style presupposes the presence of huge resources by the clients. It is interesting to know where such abundance came from immediately after the end of the wars that lasted decades. Everything can be easily explained if we assume that as a result of the Reformation, Europe was freed from the power of the Empire and stopped paying imperial taxes. And yet, the Empire not only collected taxes but also received income from international trade and the free movements of bank capital. European rulers had a certain excess of money, and they, celebrating victory, hastened to spend it on luxury. However, the euphoria of Baroque lasted a short time and apparently ended immediately after the imperial money was appropriated and spent. So, we have put forward the version that the Reformation is a large-scale and bloody movement that engulfed the whole of Europe for the right not to pay tribute to the Great Empire with its center in Russia. But in this case, in traditional history, there should remain evidence of the confrontation between Europe and the forces of the Empire, that is, Russian troops. And indeed, historical documents report that it was precisely at this time, in the middle of the 16th century, that Russia waged the so-called Livonian War for 25 years from 1558 to 1583. In the

school history course, little attention is paid to the Livonian War, and this is at least strange, because it lasted for 25 long years. In these brief historical journeys, historians claim that Russia was waging a war for the Baltic lands. But despite all the efforts made, it achieved nothing, and in the end, peace was concluded on terms unfavorable for Russia. According to the official historical version, the opposing sides in this military conflict were the Tsardom of Russia and the Livonian Order. According to historians, the Order controlled a relatively small territory that included the lands of modern-day Baltic states, part of Poland, and Sweden. As a result, historians have painted a completely ridiculous picture of a large Russian Tsardom for a long time and with no success fighting a small but proud Livonia. And doing it so unsuccessfully, to the point, that they not only gained nothing from the war, but also lost some of their own territory. However, a closer examination of these historical events reveals that in the Livonian War, Russia was fighting against practically half of Europe. Its opponent was not only the Livonian Order, but also Sweden, the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, and the Kingdom of Poland. England and the Netherlands also had indirect participation in the war. It is likely that later falsifiers of history invented this so-called Livonian War in order to hide the true events of the 16th century: the Reformation uprising and the attempts of the Russia-Horde to restore order in the Empire. They called the war with all of Western Europe a war with Livonia, attributing the achievements of all European reformers to it. It should be noted that at that time, Russians referred to all of Western Europe as either Latinia, Lithuania, or Livonia. The fact that the so-called Livonian War was a military campaign of the Russia-Horde against the rebellious Western Europe is indirectly confirmed by another fact. It was precisely at that time that a terrible wave of madness fell upon European nobility. As Western European historians themselves write, in the 16th century, 178 reichsgrafs, 88 reichsabbates, 21 dukes, a landgraf and a markgraf, 50 archbishops and bishops, 7 kurfürsts, and even Emperor Rudolf II went insane in Germany alone. The manifestations of madness are also interesting. For example, Albrecht Friedrich, Duke of Prussia, tore apart portraits of Luther and went to bed in full combat gear, expecting the hordes of Muscovites and Turks to attack Prussia at any moment. In the light of the New Chronology, such behavior of the German duke is completely understandable. The Muscovite hordes, that is, the Russian troops, really stood on the threshold of his possessions. Why was Russia-Horde able to create an empire but not able to keep it? In the midst of the rebellion in Europe, the Kazan Kingdom wanted to separate from the empire. It is possible that the Kazan Tsar and his court were closely connected with Protestant reformers in Europe. The Russia-Horde was forced to suppress the rebels both in the West and in the East. In Europe, only local military actions were carried out to quell the uprisings. The main forces were thrown into suppressing the Kazan rebellion. Probably, at that moment, it was more important for the state. In history, this event is reflected as the taking of Kazan by Ivan IV the Terrible in 1552. Only after that did Russia-Horde send punitive troops to Europe. In Russian sources, this event is described as the Livonian War. In turn, the reformist rebels, together with their allies in Moscow, constantly plotted and conspired against the central imperial authority. They actively contributed to the promotion of the pro-Western Romanov dynasty to the top of power in Moscow. As a result, in the late 16th century, a bloody Time of Troubles erupted in Russia. The old Rurik dynasty was destroyed, and the Great Russia-Horde Empire was divided into many small states. Europe became like a patchwork quilt with the many kingdoms and principalities appearing on it. The religious and political unity of Medieval Europe was destroyed. After years of war, Europe was effectively split in half between the Protestant North and the Catholic South. Rebels did not receive support from the southern Roman

peoples. The ideas of the Reformation failed to spread to Portugal, Spain, Italy, and the Balkans. These countries resisted reforms for a long time and remained loyal to the Empire. Spain resisted the split the longest. Supporters of maintaining the Empire in different European countries provided Spain with all kinds of assistance and support. But, as we know, history is written by the victors. Therefore, in the pages of history and literature, all the leaders of the Counter-Reformation were portrayed as supporters of absolutism and popular enslavement, and some of them as bloody monsters. For example, Spanish king Philip II. According to Belgian writer Charles de Coster, the author of The Legend of Thyl Ulenspiegel, Philip was a degenerate from childhood. Once, for example, he allegedly burned his monkey alive on a bonfire. Philip II's second wife, Queen of England Mary Tudor, also fought against the Reformation rebellion. During her short reign from 1553 to 1558, she tried to suppress Protestantism and return England to the fold of the Catholic Church. Reformers, who for almost 100 years had shed rivers of blood throughout Western Europe, accused Mary Tudor of having executed as many as 200 Protestants during her reign. For this, Protestant historians dubbed her Bloody Mary. The description of the ruler of the Netherlands, the military commander the Duke of Alba, is no better in the eyes of Protestant authors. In 1567, he suppressed the rebellion of the insurgents in the Netherlands, which was led by William of Orange, one of the rebel imperial governors. For this, the Duke of Alba was dubbed a degenerate, who drowned the progressive liberation movement in blood. So, the assumption that there existed a certain world empire, and European countries fought for their independence against it, logically explains the events of the so-called Reformation. All the wars that were waged in Europe starting from the 16th century, have a clear, easily explainable meaning. Blood was shed not for abstract ideas, but for purely material entities such as power and money. It also becomes clear why ruling dynasties changed precisely during this period, and what was meant by the concepts of Rome and the exorbitant power of Rome. There is still one more question, which is not at all simple. If Europe was fighting against the Empire, then against whom and what were Martin Luther's famous 95 theses directed? They clearly speak about the Catholic Church. Vatican views on the church, faith, and repentance are criticized. And what about the huge amount of other documents of the Reformation era? According to the authors of the New Chronology, the Western Church separated from Orthodoxy only during the Reformation period, after which the term Catholic came to mean only this Christian movement, that emerged as a result of the separation. Catholicism during Luther's time is not the same as modern Catholicism. And regarding the word Catholicism itself, I want to say that it is by no means something hostile or opposed to Orthodoxy. Because the full name of the Orthodox Church is the Orthodox Catholic Church. Catholic or Cafolic means universal. There is nothing alien in this word. As for Catholicism during Luther's time, it was an imperial religion. Certainly, it differed in some ways from what we had in Moscow. Because at that time, although the religion of the Empire was generally unified, in the absence of modern means of communication, such as we have now, complete unity was impossible, and there were local customs, rituals, and much that was their own, although formally it was all part of a single imperial Orthodox Catholic Church. Catholic and Cafolic are actually the same word. The thing is that in the past, this word was written with the letter "fita", but today we have lost this letter, and "fita" was pronounced in two ways, as "fe" and as "te". Therefore, it would be more correct to translate the word "Western European Catholic" as Cafolic, and also to read it that way. There may be a question as to why Luther and other reformers protested if the Church was unified and Orthodox before the Reformation. Was the Orthodox Church really selling indulgences? It is known that in Russia, in

Orthodox Russia, this did not exist and could not have existed. However, before the final division of the churches, the Roman Church could have been quite independent on many issues and not dependent on the center in Russia. For example, today in the Orthodox Church there are several patriarchates: Moscow, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, and others, and none of them are subordinate to each other. So decisions about the issuance of indulgences and many other issues for which Luther criticized the Roman Church could be made by local church leaders themselves. Obviously, it was precisely the disagreement on views about faith and repentance that caused the future schism. However, religion was unified for the time being. In the 16th century, the religion of the Empire was more or less unified. However, there were reformist movements, as in any church. One of these religious reformers was Luther. He tried to create his new faith, and he did something. However, what we have today is already subsequent interpretations of Lutheranism, when Luther's teachings were taken up by reformers pursuing purely political goals. They used Luther's name, they used his popularity, they used his religious slogans. What Luther specifically and precisely said, what he preached, we can hardly know today, because his history was completely rewritten by subsequent reformers for their political purposes. Martin Luther, as a religious reformer, could have remained a monarchist and a supporter of the Empire. It was only after the political and anti-imperial victory of the Reformation that the history of the former Lutheranism, Calvinism, and other movements was tendentiously rewritten. Historians themselves admit that Calvin's ideas were significantly changed by his successors. Thus, we are once again faced with the fact of falsification of historical events and chronicles. It is officially considered that the Reformation in Europe ended in 1648 with the signing of the Treaty of Westphalia. At that time, according to the authors of the New Chronology, a long and systematic rewriting of world history began, the main goal of which was to prevent the restoration of the Great Russian-Horde Empire. At the same time, a wave of mass book burnings swept across Europe. These burnings were of such a grand scale that they became canonical. Usually, we are told that it was the obscurantists and churchmen who destroyed progressive reformist literature. However, let us ask a simple question. Where did such a huge number of reformist books come from in such a short period of time, in an era when book creation was an expensive and very complex process, and in the midst of continuous wars, that they had to be burned on all the squares of Europe? Is it not more logical to assume that the victorious rebels were destroying old imperial books and old history? Despite the efforts of the reformers, starting from the 17th century, many of the territories cut off from the old Empire merged again around the former center. The Russian Empire of the Romanovs emerged. Russia is accused of allegedly constantly trying to expand its sphere of influence throughout the world due to innate malevolence and aggression. But perhaps the truth is different. This memory of peoples pushes them to unite again and again around the old Empire after each time it is destroyed. The destruction of a large number of authentic documents during the Reformation era led to the appearance of many historical mysteries that researchers from different countries are now futilely trying to solve. In the history of Western Europe, one of such secrets is the defeat of the Cathars. In the Middle Ages, powerful Cathar fortresses controlled trade routes and military roads throughout the south of France. Today, many of them lie in ruins. And in Russia, the true history of the uprisings of Stepan Razin in the 17th century and Yemelyan Pugachev in the 18th century is still unknown. All that we know about these events is the invention of historians and writers of the 19th century. What caused the defeat of the Cathars in Europe? Who were Razin and Pugachev really?

And what unites these seemingly unrelated events? Find out in our next part, Soldiers of the Empire. Cathars. Razin. Pugachev.

## Soldiers of the Empire. Cathars. Razin. Pugachev.

In our previous part Reformation, the Dissolution of the Empire, we told the story of a series of wars and rebellions that swept across Europe in the 16th and 17th centuries, known as the Reformation. It led to the division of the Russia-Horde Empire and the emergence of numerous new independent states on its territory. The collapse of the Empire left a significant impact on world history. However, many events of those years were misinterpreted by historians of the Scaligerian school. They were educated with an incorrect version of history and chronology, which led them to alter many historical facts to the point of being unrecognizable. In this part, we will explore three such events from European history in the 16th to 18th centuries: the defeat of the Cathars in Western Europe, and the wars of the Romanovs against Stepan Razin and Yemelyan Pugachev in Russia. It turns out that these tragic events were also consequences of the so-called Reformation. This is Languedoc-Roussillon, a region in southern France. This area is famous for the ruins of many ancient Cathar fortresses. In the Middle Ages, powerful castle-fortresses were built on the mountaintops here, controlling trade routes and military roads. The names of these castles are well-known through novels and films, such as Montségur, Peyrepertuse, Quéribus, Puivert, Roquefixade, Termes, Carcassonne, and many others. These fortresses, occupying dominant heights, housed military garrisons. However, only a very wealthy and powerful states could construct such a grand system of fortifications. As it is known, Medieval France was not such a state. So, who built these castles? And why is Languedoc still referred to as the land of the Cathars? Who were the Cathars? A number of legends are associated with the Cathars' movement, reflected in European art and folklore. Starting from the Age of Enlightenment to the present day, Catharism is considered by most researchers as the most serious adversary of the Roman Catholic Church prior to the onset of the Reformation, greatly influencing religious processes from the 14th to the 16th centuries. Traditional history claims that a new Christian doctrine, whose supporters were called Cathars, emerged in Western Europe in the 10th to 11th centuries. The positions of the Cathar adherents were particularly strong in the region of Albi in southern France, which is why they were sometimes referred to as Albigensians. Historians believe that the religion of the Cathars was greatly influenced by the Bulgarian Bogomil sect. As encyclopedias report, the 11th-century Bulgarian Bogomilism and Catharism, known in the West from the 12th to the 14th centuries, are considered to be the same religion. It is believed that the Cathar heresy, arriving from the East, developed in Bulgaria, and the name Bulgarians was preserved as a term used to describe its origin. Religious historians and priests believe that both Bogomilism and the Cathar doctrine contained serious contradictions to Christian dogma. For example, they were accused of allegedly rejecting the recognition of sacrament and the central dogma of Christianity, the Holy Trinity. Based on this, the Catholic Church declared the Cathar doctrine heretical. The opposition to Catharism was for a long time one of the main motives in the policies of the Roman popes. Despite the Catholic Church's long struggle against the Cathars, a large number of Catholics were among their numerous supporters. They were attracted to both the daily and religious way of life of the Cathars. Moreover,

many Catholic believers belonged to both churches, the Catholic Church and the Cathar Church. And in the regions where Catharism had a significant influence, there were never any religious conflicts. Historians claim that the confrontation between the Cathars and the Catholic Church reached its peak allegedly in the early 13th century. In order to combat the heretics, Pope Innocent III established the Church Inquisition and later sanctioned a crusade against the Cathar territories. The papal legate Arnaud Amaury was in charge of leading the crusade. However, the local population of the Cathar regions supported their legitimate rulers and actively resisted the crusaders. This resistance led to a 20-year war that devastated the south of France. Subsequently, historians wrote that these battles were too numerous to be listed. The Cathars defended themselves particularly fiercely in Toulouse and Carcassonne. The intensity of these battles can be judged by a fact that has reached us from the depths of time. The crusaders turned to Arnaud Amaury with a question of how to distinguish a heretic from a faithful Catholic. To which the abbot replied, Kill them all. For the Lord knows who are His. In this war, the Cathars and their supporters, including Catholic feudal lords, suffered defeat, and the subsequent systematic repressions culminated in the complete destruction of the movement. In the end, the Cathars vanished from the historical stage of the Middle Ages, and their majestic castle-fortresses were demolished by the victors. Thus, according to the traditional historical version, the confrontation between the secular and ecclesiastical authorities of France and the Cathars took place in the 13th century. During the same era, the castles of the defeated were destroyed. However, there is ample evidence that as late as the 17th century, Cathar castles existed, not as forgotten relics, but as active military fortresses. Historians have their explanation for this. They claim that after the barbaric destruction, French authorities restored the Cathar castles and turned them into their own military strongholds. As such, the castles remained until the beginning of the 17th century, and then they were destroyed once again. Theoretically, such a scenario might be possible. Destroyed, restored, destroyed again, and restored again. However, both the restoration and the destruction of such gigantic structures are highly costly endeavors. But in this strange version proposed by historians, it is not only the unusual fate of these fortresses that is surprising, but also the fact that all these transformations occurred exclusively with Cathar castles. For example, let's consider what historians say about the fate of the Cathar castle of Roquefixade. It turns out that in the 14th to 15th centuries, after the defeat of the Cathars, it served as an active royal fortress. And, obviously, a royal garrison would serve in well-equipped fortifications, not in gray ruins. However, the further account resembles a bad joke. Supposedly, in 1632, King Louis XIII, while traveling from Paris to Toulouse, passed by this castle. He stopped and pondered for a while. And then, allegedly, he ordered the complete destruction of the castle because it was no longer useful, and it had become too expensive to maintain. However, if it was truly beyond the royal treasury's means to keep the castle in a state of military readiness, it would have been logical to simply withdraw the garrison, lock up the barracks, and leave the castle to decay under the influence of time and weather. For example, that's how the castle of Peyrepertuse quietly and naturally, according to the traditional history, fell into ruins. Most likely, this semi-fantastical story was invented by Scaligerian historians after 1632 to somehow explain the true reasons for the castle's destruction during the wars of the first half of the 17th century. They couldn't admit that the crusades against the Cathars took place in the 16th and 17th centuries. After all, these events had already been placed in the 13th century by historians, so they had to concoct a ridiculous fable about a strange royal decree. But if historians came up with such a ridiculous explanation for the ruins of Roquefixade, they didn't bother inventing anything about the

castle of Montségur. It is known that it served as an active royal fortress until the 16th century, and then it was supposedly simply abandoned. But if the king didn't give the order to destroy it, why did the castle end up in such a deplorable state? Today, it is just a pile of rubble. Only the outer belt of walls survived. It is inconceivable that such a structure could have collapsed on its own. Even today, it is evident how sturdy it was. Huge stone blocks, neatly fitted together and firmly cemented. The massive walls and towers form a solid stone-cement monolith. Such walls don't collapse by themselves. To destroy them, one needs gunpowder and cannons. But why would they expend so much effort and resources to demolish these formidable fortifications, even if they had lost their strategic value? Historians cannot answer this question. As we have already mentioned, secular and Christian historians believe that the Cathar doctrine is closely connected to the ideas of the Bulgarian religious sect of Bogomils. Just like Catharism, the Christian Church considers the teachings of the Bogomils as heresy. It is known that the religious movement of the Bogomils came to Bulgaria from the East. But who were these people, and where exactly did they come from? In the history of Paul the Deacon and in the chronicles of the dukes and princes of Benevento, there is information that these people were Bulgars who came from the part of Asian Sarmatia irrigated by the Volga. This means that the Bogomils came from the Volga, which is why they were called Bulgars, that is, Volgars, Volgarians or Bulgarians, and their settlement territory became known as Bulgaria. Historians themselves say that in the 13th century, the territory in modern Bulgaria was populated by people originating from the Volga. This aligns well with our reconstruction. In our reconstruction, the great, or Mongol conquest began in the 13th century. It emerged from the Russia-Horde, where the mighty Volga River flows. The conquest engulfed not only Bulgaria but also Western European countries such as Germany, Italy, and France. Thus, Bulgars, also known as Cathars, appeared in Western Europe. Even today, in northern France, Cathars are called Bulgars. In Italy and other regions, they are sometimes referred to as Bougres. Indeed, on maps compiled by modern historians, the spread of Cathars-Bogomils is shown exactly in these regions: Spain, France, Germany, England, Greece, Turkey, and the Balkans. The Cathars arrived in Western Europe at the forefront of the Great Conquest in the 14th century. They remained there until the 17th century, until the victory of the Reformation rebellion. After the triumph of the Reformation rebellion, Western European rebels began a fierce struggle against Russia-Horde and the remnants of the Russian descendants, including the Cathars. According to our reconstruction, some of the crusades that supposedly took place in the 13th century were directed against the Cathars in Western Europe. The Albigensian Crusade and others were actually campaigns of the 17th century that ultimately led to the defeat and destruction of the Cathars. This version proposed by the authors of the New Chronology provides an answer to the question we posed at the beginning of our book. Who built more than a hundred castles known as Cathar castles? It is quite obvious that a small nation-state would not have been capable of constructing such a powerful network of military fortifications. Moreover, these fortresses could not have been built and, most importantly, maintained by minor princes and barons. Only a very strong and wealthy state could have afforded to do so. The Cathar castles were strategic points of the Russia-Horde Empire on the conquered and colonized territories of Western Europe. It was a grand chain of fortifications that controlled all movements across Western Europe, including movements along rivers and roads. During the Reformation rebellion, all these castles were seized and destroyed by the rebels. By studying the documents that have survived to this day, we have discovered that these castles, the Cathar castles, remained intact and undamaged until the 16th century and the beginning of the 17th century. They were only destroyed

starting from the second half of the 17th century; although historians today claim that these castles were supposedly destroyed long ago in the 13th-14th centuries. Obviously, a complete picture of those events could have been reconstructed from texts written by the inhabitants of the castles themselves. However, after their destruction, very few written documents remained. Historians suggest that Cathar writings were quite numerous, but the severe persecution led to the disappearance of most texts because the Catholic Church subjected Catharism to the most terrifying repressions. After all, for the rebellious reformers, not only the living bearers of the idea of the Great Empire, the Cathars were dangerous, but also any material evidence of the lives of these people, their true purpose, and faith. In the modern world, attitudes toward the Cathars are mixed. On the one hand, in southern France, the dramatic and captivating story of the unsubdued Cathars is widely promoted. Cathar cities and castles, stories of the Inquisition's stakes, attract the attention of tourists. On the other hand, it is constantly emphasized that Catharism is a highly harmful heresy and that it existed here so long ago that there is no trace of it left. However, images of Cathar Christian symbols still survive in some Gothic cathedrals in France. This is what a Cathar cross looks like, inscribed within a circle. Similar crosses can be seen in the famous Cathedral of Notre-Dame de Paris. Moreover, Cathar crosses are present here in two forms: flat and relief-convex. They are depicted on stone sculptures, mosaics, stained glass windows, and main columns inside the church. Even above the main entrance of the cathedral, on the central portal depicting the Last Judgment, there is a sculptural image of Christ. Behind his head, on the wall, there is a stone Cathar cross. Let's compare this image with Orthodox icons, where a halo is usually depicted behind Christ's head, and in the background of the halo, there is a cross. As we can see, these images are practically identical. Therefore, there is nothing heretical about the Cathar cross. So why has the Christian Church been claiming for several centuries that Cathar faith is heresy and that Cathar symbols are heretical? And why do these symbols still proudly adorn not some provincial church but the colonnade of one of the most important churches not only in Paris but in all of France? Today it is believed that the construction of the cathedral began in the 13th century. Historians emphasize that it was built during the era of the struggle against the Cathars. But if they were fighting against them, why did the church allow the walls of its cathedral to be adorned with crosses of its enemies, the heretical Cathars? The authors of the New Chronology believe that there is nothing surprising about this. According to our reconstruction, Catharism or Bogomilism was not heresy but rather a thoroughly Orthodox Christianity of that time. However, after the victory of the Reformation rebellion, as often happens, the victors declared the defeated as heretics. Today, in textbooks, Cathars or Bogomils are presented as heretics who needed to be eradicated. This is all done on paper. It is purely a paper-based political and ideological activity of the 17th century. In reality, things were not like that. It was the Orthodox Christianity of its time. And its symbolism was Orthodox, as can be seen even today from the remnants of Cathar crosses, for example. This is the city of Toulouse, the Paul Dupuy Museum. In its basement, there are several stone crosses. Their appearance fully corresponds not only to the images in the Notre-Dame de Paris Cathedral, but also to the Orthodox crosses from Russian churches of the 15th century. For example, this cross from the Church of the Resurrection in Rostov, which historians date back to the end of the 15th century. The crosses in the Paul Dupuy Museum are also dated to the 14th-15th centuries. This is indicated on a nearby plaque. However, they are not called Cathar crosses but stone discoidal steles. On one hand, there is no objection to that. They are indeed discoidal steles, made of stone. On the other hand, why not explicitly state that they are Cathar crosses? It is obvious. Probably because

such dating does not align with the traditional version of Cathar history. In our part, Reformation, the Dissolution of the Empire, we talked about how European historians deliberately distorted the entire world history after the victory of the Reformation rebellion. The goal of this massive falsification was to completely conceal the true picture of historical events, especially those that took place in Europe during the 16th and 17th centuries. As a result, the rebels who were true renegades from the old faith were declared good, while those who remained faithful to Orthodoxy were labeled as bad, heretics. The fate of the Cathars was terrible and tragic. The Reformation rebellion tore the Empire apart. Some regions of Western Europe remained loyal to the imperial idea and resisted like the Cathars until the end. However, the dying Empire could not save itself or them. The 500 Cathars who took refuge in the castle of Montségur resisted the traitors to the Empire the longest. The Crusaders besieged them for an entire year. Assaults on the castle ended in failure time after time. It was captured only through betrayal. The survivors were given a choice between renouncing their faith or being burned at the stake. Over 200 Cathars refused to renounce. They all perished in the flames on the stakes erected at the foot of the mountain. In 1960, a monument to the fallen Cathars was erected at the site of the burning of the defenders of Montségur castle. At its base lies a small flat stone on which the words of English philosopher Francis Bacon are engraved: It is an heretic that makes the fire, Not she which burns in it. Today, these words, in addition to the philosophical meaning that Bacon put into them, became literal. So, we believe that with the help of Anatoly Fomenko and Gleb Nosovsky, we have managed to find the answer to the question, Who are the Cathars? The Cathars were conquerors who came to Western Europe from the Russia-Horde in the 13th - early 14th century. They were not heretics; they professed Orthodox Christianity, the unified religion of the entire Empire at that time. In the 17th century, during the Reformation revolt, the Cathars remained loyal to their faith, their ideas, and the idea of the Great Empire. They fought to the bitter end against the rebels of Western Europe. Unfortunately, the Cathars were not the only or last victims of the Reformation. It is believed that the Reformation process in Western Europe ended in 1648 with the signing of the Peace of Westphalia. However, Anatoly Fomenko and Gleb Nosovsky argue that this is just a formal historical date. In reality, the wars of the Reformation continued until the mid-18th century, not only in Europe but also in Russia. The authors of the New Chronology include the wars of the Romanovs with Stepan Razin in the 17th century, and later with Emelyan Pugachev already in the 18th century among them. In 1667, during the reign of Alexei Mikhailovich, the country was engulfed in the largest rebellion, later called the Razin Rebellion. It is also known as the peasant war. It is believed that supposedly peasants and Cossacks rebelled against their landlords and the tsar. The rebellion spread to vast territories of the Russian Empire, lasting for four years, but was eventually suppressed by the Romanovs. What do we know today about Stepan Timofeyevich Razin? Virtually no authentic documents have been preserved from the Razin's side, which lost this war. It is believed that only seven or six of them survived. But at the same time, historians say that only one can be considered genuine. Although it is highly doubtful and gives the impression of a draft. Moreover, historians acknowledge that this document was not written by Razin himself, but by his associates who were far from his main headquarters on the Volga. Russian historian Viktor Ivanovich Buganov in his work Razin and his men, referring to a multi-volume academic collection of documents on the Razin rebellion, wrote that the overwhelming majority of these documents came from the government camp of the Romanovs. From this stems the silencing of the facts, the tendentiousness in their coverage, and even direct lies. What did the rebels want? What were their demands from the supreme rulers in Moscow? Well,

it is known that the Razin rebels fought under the banner of a war for the great sovereign against the traitorous boyars in Moscow. Historians explain this seemingly strange slogan by saying that the Razin rebels were very naive and wanted to protect the unfortunate Moscow tsar, Alexei Mikhailovich, from his own corrupt Moscow boyars. But allegedly, one of the Razin documents contains the following text: In the present year, in 179, October, the 15th day, by the decree of the Great Sovereign and by his royal charter, we, the great Don army, left the Don to serve him, the Great Sovereign, so that we, all of us, would not finally perish from them, the traitorous boyars. Let's pay attention to the fact that the name of Alexei Mikhailovich is not mentioned in the document. Historians consider this detail insignificant. Since it is written Great Sovereign, it means that it refers to Tsar Alexei Romanov. However, in their other documents, the Razin rebels express a clearly contemptuous attitude towards the Romanov authorities. They refer to all their actions and documents as thieving, meaning unlawful. And here arises an obvious contradiction. The rebels, for some reason, do not recognize Alexei Mikhailovich Romanov as the legitimate ruler of Russia, but they go to fight for him. Our reconstruction eliminates this contradiction. We believe that Stepan Timofeyevich Razin was not just a Cossack ataman but a military leader of the great sovereign of all Russia, but not Alexei Romanov, against whom he fought. The thing is, after the Time of Troubles and the ascent of the Romanovs to power in Moscow, the southern part of Russia, apparently, seceded. And there was a sovereign from an old lineage ruling there, with the capital in Astrakhan. It was the Astrakhan sovereign that Stepan Timofeyevich Razin served. He was his military leader. Presumably, the Astrakhan sovereign of that time was from the Cherkassky princely family. We cannot say for this certain, but there is a lot of data that speaks about it. Which of the Cherkassky princes exactly was the sovereign, we cannot say. The fact is that the history of that time was heavily distorted by the Romanov historians, and it has to be reconstructed literally bit by bit. The Cherkassky family was one of the old royal lineages of the Russia-Horde. They were considered descendants of Egyptian sultans, which is reflected in their family coat of arms. It is known that from 1380 to 1517, Circassian sultans ruled in Egypt. Unfortunately, today the original meaning of the word Cherkassy is almost forgotten. Now scholars place Historical Cherkasia or Cherkessia in the North Caucasus, while adding, that at the end of the 16th century, this name disappears from historical documents. However, it is well known that in Russia until the 18th century, the term Cherkasy referred to the Dnieper Cossacks. As for the presence of someone from the Cherkassky princes in Razin's troops, there is evidence to support this. Even in the Romanovs' version of history, it is conveyed that there was a certain Alexei Grigorievich Cherkashenin in Razin's army, one of the Cossack atamans referred to as Razin's sworn brother. It is possible that this referred to Prince Grigorii Sunchaleevich Cherkassky, who shortly before the Razin uprising served as a military leader in Astrakhan but was soon killed on his estate after the Romanovs' victory in 1672. The Romanovs did not easily achieve victory in this war. Razin's campaigns on the Volga were accompanied by mass uprisings of serfs. As it is known, in the Sobornoye Ulozheniye of 1649, which is the Council Code, Tsar Alexei Romanov established indefinite serfdom in Russia. Therefore, it is not surprising that in the recently subjugated regions of the Volga, peasants joined Razin's troops. Following the Russian peasants, large groups of other Volga peoples also rose up: Mari, Chuvash, Mordvins. But in addition to the common people, Romanov troops also switched sides to join Razin. German newspapers of that time wrote: So many strong troops ended up with Razin that Alexei Mikhailovich was so terrified that he no longer intended to send troops against him. The Romanovs managed to turn the tide of the war with great difficulty. There is evidence that

the Romanovs had to supplement their troops with Western European mercenaries. This was because after frequent cases of defection to Razin's side, Russian and Tatar troops were already considered unreliable by the Romanovs. In contrast, the Razin forces had a negative attitude towards foreigners. If any foreign mercenaries were captured, the Cossacks usually killed them. Historians present all these large-scale events merely as the suppression of a peasant revolt. The Romanovs actively introduced this version immediately after their victory. Even special charters, called sovereign exemplars, were produced, in which the official version of the Razin uprising was detailed. Local authorities were ordered to read the charter aloud to all people at the government office more than once. But if a four-year military confrontation was nothing more than a revolt of the common folk, it means that half the country rebelled against the Romanovs. Or perhaps it was not a revolt at all? According to our reconstruction, the so-called Razin uprising was not an ordinary peasant revolt but a major war between two emerging states at that time. It is generally believed that in 1613, Mikhail Romanov became the Tsar of All Russia. Most likely, this is incorrect. Initially, the Romanovs controlled only a small part of the former metropolis of the Horde Empire, part of White Russia, and part of the Northern Volga, including Novgorod the Great, also known as Yaroslavl. The second Russian state emerged in the south with its capital in Astrakhan. Between these two kingdoms, a large-scale struggle was waged at that time. This hypothesis is supported by surviving Western European documents as well. For example, Viktor Ivanovich Buganov in his book Razin and his men, which we have already cited, provides another interesting document. It turns out that the uprising in Russia led by Razin caused a great resonance in Europe, especially in Western Europe. Foreign informants often viewed the events in Russia as a struggle for power, for the throne. Moreover, the Razin uprising was called the Tatar rebellion. In November 1671, Astrakhan was captured by Romanov forces. This date is considered the end of the war between the Romanov Russia and the troops of Stepan Timofeyevich Razin. However, the circumstances of the defeat of Astrakhan are practically unknown. It is believed that Razin himself was captured in the Don region as a result of betrayal and executed in Moscow. But even in the capital, the Romanovs did not feel safe. Jacob Reutenfels, an eyewitness to Razin's execution, wrote: To prevent unrest that the Tsar feared, the square where the criminal received his punishment was surrounded by a triple row of the most loyal soldiers, by the Tsar's order. Only foreigners were allowed into the enclosed area. And squads of troops stood at the intersections throughout the city. Why were the Romanovs ultimately able to win the war against Razin, who was supported by a large part of the country's population? Some researchers believe that the Razin rebels catastrophically lacked firearms and gunpowder. At that time, there were very few weapons and gunpowder factories in southern Russia. Allegedly, there are testimonies that due to the shortage of weapons, Razin's men did not accept volunteers who did not have their own guns. Did this become the main reason for Razin's defeat? Most likely not. Finding an answer to this question can only be done by studying it impartially and without looking back at the cries of Romanov historians. It will certainly not be easy to do so. As we mentioned earlier, there are no authentic documents left from Stepan Razin. The Romanovs exerted tremendous efforts to find and destroy every single document from the Razin side. The thoroughness with which they were sought is evidenced by the following fact. During the interrogation, Razin's younger brother Frol claimed that Razin buried a jug with documents on the island of the Don River, in the spill-stream under the willow tree. Romanov troops dug up the entire island and sifted through the soil beneath all the willow trees, but they found nothing. Frol was executed only a few years later, probably in an attempt to extract from him accurate information

about the documents. But he took that secret to his grave. Perhaps some documents about the Razin war were stored in the Kazan and Astrakhan archives. Unfortunately, these archives have disappeared. This is Encyclopedia Britannica, a fundamental publication known worldwide. Since its inception in 1768, it has been the most comprehensive collection of information from various fields of knowledge. This work represented the pinnacle of encyclopedic knowledge in the 18th century. In 1771, the Encyclopedia Britannica recorded some interesting information. In the Geography section, there are five geographical maps: Europe, Asia, Africa, North America, and South America. These maps are meticulously compiled. The Geography section ends with a table listing all the known countries at that time, indicating their areas, capitals, and distances from London. Interestingly, in the territory that, as we believe today, belonged to the Russian Empire, there were several states in the 18th century. Namely, Russia with its capital in St. Petersburg, covering an area of 1 million 103 thousand 485 square miles. Moscow or Great Tartary or Tartaria with its capital in Tobolsk, which had an area almost three times larger than that of Russia, amounting to 3 million 50 thousand square miles. Independent Tartary with its capital in Samarkand and Chinese Tartary with its capital in Xian. So, we can see that in 1771, the largest state was Great Tartary. All other countries were at least half that size. It not only owned lands in Eurasia but also on the North American continent. So where did this enormous state disappear to? Why have historians pretended for almost 250 years that it never existed? When studying the 18th-century geographical maps, one understands that during that era, Great Tartary was practically inaccessible to Europeans. It is evident that they had vague notions about certain parts of its territory. The western part of the North American continent is not depicted at all on these maps. European cartographers of that time did not know whether America connected to Siberia or if there was a strait there. Perhaps Europeans were not concerned about this. But why didn't the American government show interest in neighboring lands? After all, historians claim that these lands already belonged to the United States. Everything changed at the end of the 18th century when the tumultuous conquest of Great Tartary's lands began. It happened from two sides simultaneously. For the first time the forces of the Romanovs entered Siberia controlled by the Russia-Horde, and the Far East. And the forces of the recently formed United States of America, which emerged upon the ruins of the Russia-Horde Empire in America, entered the western half of the North American continent, stretching south to California and east to the middle of the continent. After these events, there was no longer a white spot on the new geographical maps with the inscription Terra incognita covering the northwest of America. And the inscription Great Tartary disappeared from the map of Siberia. But why were these lands conquered in the 18th century? In the late 18th century, the final decisive battle took place between Western Europe and the Romanov Russia on one side, and the last fragment of the Russia-Horde, the Tobolsk Siberian-American state, on the other. This enormous and large-scale war was then falsely presented in history as a war against peasants and Cossacks under the leadership of Yemelyan Pugachev. Romanov historians, as usual, completely distorted history and presented such a major war as the suppression of a peasant uprising. In reality, based on what we have learned about Russian history, we must completely reevaluate the events of the late 18th century. It was the last major turning point in world history that solidified the victory of new forces, new power in the world, and essentially marked the beginning of the modern history of the 19th century, which we are all familiar with. How is the war between the Romanovs and Pugachev presented in traditional history? Just like the rebellion of Stepan Razin, it is impossible to judge the war with Pugachev based on primary sources. Until the end of the Romanov’s rule, the

case of Yemelyan Pugachev was an important state secret. When Alexander Sergeyevich Pushkin worked on The History of Pugachev, he encountered the fact that the case was sealed. Pushkin wrote that he had brought together in his work everything that the government had published regarding Pugachev, as well as whatever appeared to be reliable in those foreign authors who wrote of him. These materials were sufficient for Pushkin's relatively short work. His History of Pugachev spans only 36 pages. Pushkin was aware that his work was far from complete. He wrote: The future historian who is allowed to unseal the Pugachev file will find it easy to correct and amplify my work. So, even a well-known figure in the Russian Empire like Alexander Pushkin was unable to familiarize himself with the documents regarding the so-called, Pugachev's rebellion. Hiding the originals far away from prying eyes, as usual, the Romanovs fabricated their own history of those events. But this story, like many other fabrications of Romanov historians, contains numerous contradictions. Until now, the forces of Yemelyan Pugachev are still referred to as bands. However, bands usually consist of a specific category of people. However, it is known that when Pugachev took cities, he was joyfully welcomed by the entire population, both common folk and merchants, and even church hierarchs. As Pushkin wrote, In Penza, the inhabitants came out to meet Pugachev with icons and bread and fell on their knees before him. Moreover, the Ural factories worked for Pugachev and cast cannons for him. The Romanov version of history claims that the workers of the Ural factories rebelled and joined Pugachev's illegal uprising. However, in reality, it was not the case. Most likely, the Ural factories belonged to Moscow Tartary from the very beginning, whose forces were commanded by Pugachev. Therefore, naturally, they served the army of Yemelyan Pugachev. It is commonly believed that Pugachev unlawfully proclaimed himself as the Tsar and issued royal manifestos upon entering cities. Romanov historians say that he adopted the name of the late spouse of Empress Catherine the Great, Tsar Peter III, who died in July 1762. But here's what Pushkin writes. On July 27 Pugachev entered Saransk. He was received not only by the common folk, by the clergy and merchants. In Saransk, Archimandrite Alexander received Pugachev with a cross and Gospel, and during the prayer service, Her Majesty Ustinia Petrovna was mentioned in the litany. In other words, there are testimonies that the archimandrite of Saransk called not Catherine the empress, but a completely different queen. Today we no longer know the true name of the Tsar of Moscow Tartary who ruled in Tobolsk, nor the true name of the leader of his forces, so to speak, Pugachev. The fact is that the word "Pugachev" is most likely invented by the Romanov propagandists, derived from the word "poogach" or "poogalo" meaning scarecrow. It is similar to how they invented the last name Otrepiev for Tsar Dmitry Ivanovich from the word "otrehbiye", meaning garbage, lees of society. This is a technique used by experienced propagandists to discredit a historical figure by giving them a poorly sounding name. In the Romanov version of suppressing the Pugachev rebellion, the victory of the Romanovs came, in general, without much effort. The troops of Catherine the Great easily crushed the disorganized and unruly gangs of Pugachev. But even from this edited version, it is clear that the regular army was sent against some kind of insignificant bands. The renowned historian Evgeny Petrovich Saveliyev wrote in his book, Ancient History of the Cossacks, that, besides other forces, 14 Don regiments fought against Pugachev. But despite this resistance, Pugachev made quite successful advances toward Moscow, which horrified Catherine. She wanted to personally lead the troops to save Moscow and Russia, but she was dissuaded from this decision. By that time, the war with Turkey had ended, and Alexander Suvorov had returned from the front, becoming the commander-in-chief of all the forces. In other words, the task of fighting against the disorganized gangs was entrusted to

the country's top military leader. Even in the sanitized Romanov version of history, it is evident that the so-called peasant revolt was opposed by the mobilized regular army. Moreover, Suvorov, the greatest military commander of that time, was called upon, which historians usually conceal. It was a large-scale war, and by no means the suppression of a riot. Huge professional forces were involved from both sides: the army, cavalry, and artillery. If historians had not distorted the true events of that time, these glaring contradictions, visible to the naked eye, would not have arisen. Another strange fact from the history of the Pugachev's War. Historians report that Pugachev's trial took place in Moscow, in the Throne Room of the Kremlin Palace. But if Pugachev was really a simple Cossack, an impostor, the leader of some gang, would he have been tried in the famous Throne Room? It seems inappropriate, not fitting his rank. However, if Pugachev was the embodiment of the Romanovs' main enemy, the Great Tartary, and they were celebrating their victory over it, then the symbolic choice of the Kremlin's Throne Room becomes completely understandable and even necessary. Regardless of who actually stood before the court under the fabricated nickname Pugachev, it was a trial against the Russia-Horde Empire, which finally ceased to exist to the joy of the Romanovs and their Western European allies. The fact that the Romanovs were not fighting against peasant rebels but against the armies of the Great Tartary is indicated by a fact cited by historians themselves. Only from the late 18th century, that is, after the defeat of Pugachev, did Siberia become a place of exile. For example, only from 1790 were the convicted individuals sent to Tobolsk. Prior to that, in the Russian Empire the famous Solovkii, that is, Solovetsky Islands were used for exile. This means that only after winning the war against Pugachev, did the Romanovs gain access to Siberia, which had been closed to them before. And the United States gained access to the western half of the North American continent only after their victory over Pugachev. In the division of these lands, the Romanovs obtained only Alaska. Probably because it directly adjoined Siberia. However, in the end, they had to give it to the Americans for only a nominal amount, a paltry sum. In 1775, the Russian government prohibited even mentioning the name of Pugachev. The stanitsa Zimoveyskaya, where he supposedly was born, was renamed to Potemkinskaya. The River Yaik was renamed Ural, and the Yaik Cossacks began to be called Ural Cossacks. The Volga Cossack Host was abolished. The Zaporozhiyan Sech was liquidated. By the order of Catherine the Great, all the events of this war were consigned to eternal oblivion and deep silence. The false version of history and chronology became the cause of yet another historical mystery. The mystery of the Etruscans origin. Restoring the true history of this ancient people became a real problem for professional historians. To learn who the Etruscans really were, where they came from to the Apennine Peninsula, and where they disappeared, read our next part, Etruscans Are Russians.

## Etruscans are Russians

In traditional history, there are still many unresolved historical and chronological mysteries. One of them is the mystery of the ancient Etruscans. They were a people who appeared in Italy, supposedly in the 8th century BC, even before the foundation of Rome, and created a remarkable culture there. Then they mysteriously disappeared, leaving behind numerous monuments covered with incomprehensible inscriptions that scholars still cannot decipher. Moreover, among historians there is an opinion that Etruscan inscriptions cannot be read. Therefore, the expression "Etruscan is not readable" has become widespread. Until this day, many scholars are convinced that Etruscan texts

will never be deciphered under any circumstances, neither in the present nor in the future. But why are they so certain? Perhaps these ancient inscriptions hold some secret that greatly puzzles and even frightens historians. In ancient times, in the territory of the modern Italian province of Tuscany, in Central Italy, between the Arno and Tiber rivers, there existed a country called Etruria. The inhabitants of this country were called Etruscans. The authority of this state extended to the south and north of the Arno and Tiber, and to the east, reaching the Adriatic Sea. Traditional history claims that this was in the first millennium BC. The Etruscan civilization was highly advanced and had a significant influence on the formation of Roman civilization. In the 14th-16th centuries, it was Etruria that became the cradle of the Renaissance culture. Historians have been studying the Etruscan issue for centuries, however, the world of the Etruscans has never become closer or clearer to them. To this day, Etruscologists cannot solve the two main mysteries of the Etruscans. As historians themselves claim, neither the origin of the Etruscans nor their language has been precisely established. The first mystery is the origin of the Etruscans. There is no conclusive evidence supporting any single theory about the origin of this people. For a long time, three versions were the most widespread. One of them is the so-called Eastern Theory of the origin of Etruscan civilization. It was based on the authority of the so called ancient authors, particularly Herodotus. According to this version, the Etruscans migrated from the Eastern Mediterranean. Herodotus referred to the Etruscans as Tyrrhenians or Tyrsenians. To this day, the part of the Mediterranean Sea between the Apennine Peninsula and the islands of Sicily, Sardinia, and Corsica is named the Tyrrhenian Sea because for several centuries the Etruscans dominated this region, as well as most of the Apennine Peninsula. This was before even Rome claimed supremacy in Italy. Therefore, it is not surprising that Greek and Roman historians wrote a lot about the Etruscans. The second theory of the origin of the Etruscans belongs to Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who challenged Herodotus' version. In his work Roman Antiquities, Dionysius claimed that the Etruscans were not settlers but the indigenous and oldest people of Italy, distinct from all their neighbors on the Apennine Peninsula in terms of language and customs. In the mid-18th century, a third version emerged, known as the Northern theory of the origin of the Etruscans. It was proposed by the French historian Nicolas Fréret. According to his opinion, the Etruscans, along with other Italian tribes, entered the territory of Italy through the Alpine passes. This version had no support in ancient tradition and lacked any material evidence. However, in the 19th century, it was considered almost the sole key to the mystery of Etruscan origins. This theory was particularly popular among German historians. There are many perspectives that have been subjected to modern criticism. Today, the problem lies in the fact that archaeology cannot favor any particular theory. Thus, various assumptions remain open. One modern theory from the 1990s belongs to the renowned etruscologist Massimo Pallottino. It suggests that the Etruscan civilization, as we know it, originated in Italy. This is true. However, this theory did not solve the problem of the Etruscan origins. Was this people, who had their own language, of Italian origin, or did they come from somewhere in prehistoric times? My personal opinion is that we should not underestimate the opinion of such a significant historian as Herodotus, who in the 5th century BC recognized the eastern origin of the Etruscans, from Turkey. But in the mid-19th century, Russian archaeologist and Slavic historian Alexander Dmitrievich Chertkov proposed his theory of the origin of the Etruscans. He traveled across Europe for many years, living in Austria, Switzerland, and Italy. In studying the ancient history of the Etruscans, he concluded that they were Slavs. The scholarly world received Chertkov's research with indifferent skepticism, and his books were soon forgotten. Historians

could not accept the idea that Russians lived in Italy even before the emergence of Rome and founded the ancient Etruscan culture. Because in the Scaligerian concept of history, this seemed senseless. Independent of Chertkov, the Slavic version of the Etruscan origin was proposed by Polish archaeologist and collector Tadeusz Wolański. In the 20th century, the theories of Chertkov and Wolański found confirmation in the research of Russian scholars Anatoly Fomenko and Gleb Nosovskiy. The history of the Etruscans remains highly intriguing and continues to attract a lot of interest, both in the West and in our own country. However, all these studies are heading in a strange and seemingly dead-end direction. It is commonly assumed that the Etruscans were an entirely separate civilization that could not have had any connection to the Slavs. Therefore, when the works of Ciampi, Chertkov, and Wolański emerged in the 19th century, providing evidence that Etruscan inscriptions were written in the Slavic language, at least many of them, these works were not acknowledged. They were not refuted, no errors were found in them; they simply went unnoticed. And even now, more than a hundred years later, they have not been recognized by the world of Etruscology. It is only in the light of the New Chronology that these works are seen in a completely different way. It becomes clear that Ciampi, Wolański, and Chertkov made truly significant discoveries, and their findings should attract the attention of scholars. Indeed, etruscologists unjustifiably ignore the research of Wolański and Chertkov. Their works help solve another mystery that scientists have been unable to unravel: the language of the Etruscans. In the Renaissance epoch, all the lettering found in Italy that differed from Latin graphically, was presumed Etruscan. Currently, there are over twelve thousand known Etruscan inscriptions. However, very few of them contain more than twenty words. All kinds of alphabets were employed to decipher these texts: Hebrew, Arabic, Anglo-Saxon, runic, and even Chinese, but all efforts were in vain. Hence the saying, Etruscan is not readable. In 1825, the Italian scholar Sebastiano Ciampi proposed using the Slavic alphabet to decipher Etruscan inscriptions. The reason was that he had been a professor at the University of Warsaw for several years. After learning some Polish, the Italian scholar was astonished to find that he could read and even understand some Etruscan inscriptions. Upon his return to Italy, Ciampi eagerly shared his discovery with his colleagues. However, they sternly pointed out to him that the Germans, as the most authoritative scholars in Europe, had long proven that the Slavs did not appear on the historical stage before the 6th century AD, or even later. Consequently, in Italy, no one paid due attention to Ciampi's words. Failing to garner attention for his call to explore the Slavic interpretation of Etruscan inscriptions, the scholar became disheartened. The problems related to the study of the Etruscan language have absolutely nothing to do with the alphabet. The Etruscan alphabet is very clear. It is the Greek alphabet imported from Cumae, a part of Greece. The Etruscan alphabet, just like the Latin script, is a transformation of the Greek alphabet. Therefore, the Etruscan alphabet is easily readable. We can read it perfectly fine. The problem lies in the language. Let me give you a modern example. I can read Polish text perfectly well. It is written in Latin letters. However, I won't understand anything because it's the Slavic language. The same applies here; we can easily read Etruscan texts but don't understand them because we don't know their language. Tadeusz Wolański and Alexander Chertkov were more consistent in their studies of Etruscan texts, as Slavic languages were their native tongues. Wolański achieved the most interesting results in deciphering Etruscan inscriptions. For convenience of deciphering, he compiled a special table that allowed him to successfully translate many Etruscan texts. Here's what the table looks like. The first column shows the Etruscan alphabet, the second column shows Cyrillic, the third column shows the Polish alphabet, and the fourth column shows

the Bohemian alphabet. Complex letters that represent a combination of several letters are displayed at the bottom left of the table. By the way, Cyrillic also has complex letters like: Я, Ю, КСИ, ПСИ and others. Notice that the Cyrillic letters and Etruscan letters are more or less similar. For example, letter: ГЛАГОЛЬ, ЕСТЬ, ЗЕЛО, КАКО, ЛЮДИ, МЫСЛИТЕ, НАШ, ПОКОЙ, ТВЕРДО, УТ, ША, ЯТЬ. The authors of the New Chronology, Anatoly Fomenko and Gleb Nosovskiy, believe that this table allows us to visually see the closeness between the Etruscan language and the Slavic languages. But how does one, using this table, read a specific text? Wolański approached the decipherment of Etruscan texts quite simply. He took an Etruscan text, then used a table created by Wolański. This is a very nontrivial, very important discovery of his. In this text, the letters are replaced with Cyrillic according to his table. A Cyrillic text is obtained. After that, it is necessary to determine in which direction it is written: right to left or left to right. In the past, different peoples wrote in both ways. After that, it is necessary to understand how the text is divided into words and try to read it in Russian, in Slavic. As our experience and Wolański's experience show, usually after this rather simple operation, the meaning of the text becomes clear. Obviously, like any old Russian text, the Etruscan text will have to be read several times, delving into its meaning. The thing is that in old texts there are no spaces between words. This greatly complicates reading, but nevertheless, with some effort, it can be read. According to Wolański, it turns out that the difficulty of reading the Etruscan text is not much higher than reading many Old Russian texts, which also contain individual unfamiliar words. However, most Etruscan words are still understandable. This can be confirmed by reading several translations of Etruscan inscriptions made by Wolański. From Theodor Mommsen's essay The Lower Italian Dialects, Wolański learned about a funerary monument found in 1846 near the Italian town of Crecchio. Since 1852, this archaeological monument has been preserved in the National Museum in Naples. Interestingly, in his book, Mommsen wrote that even an attempt to interpret this inscription would be a very bold one indeed. Wolański attempted to translate this text, and here is what he came up with. All-father from Paradise, above Vim and Dim, you are the Yezmen of Russia. Take care of my home and my children, greatest Yezmen! Hekate’s domain is far away. I set forth to the end of the earth. And, verily, this is so, just like Aeneas was my forefather. Together with Lad in Elysium, you shall drink from the Lethe and forget. O! Dear one, kind one! Certainly, it cannot be said that in Wolański's translation the meaning of the Etruscan text became fully understandable. That is not the case. However, it is absolutely evident that there are numerous understandable Russian words and entire phrases in it, which collectively make up Russian expressions, comprising more than half of the text. That's a lot. It should be noted that when reading old Etruscan texts, Wolański was convinced that they were written long before Christ, and therefore, there could be nothing Christian in them. However, according to the New Chronology, these texts are already Christian, written after Christ. Therefore, they may well contain familiar Christian expressions known to us from church books. This makes the text more comprehensible because, in reality, they are indeed Christian texts. And indeed, if one is not afraid to see Christian phrases in this inscription, here is what emerges. And thus said the Great Lord to Maidim, Yezmen and Russia, he is also the guardian of my home and children. Fair Yezmen! Yekatezin is far away; only faith, the faith of Czar Aeneas sitting with Lad and Elijah. Do you remember, or do you forget? Oh, dear one, kind one! We see a fully meaningful Old Russian text, although unknown names are mentioned: Maidim, Yezmen. Presumably, these are old names of some localities in Italy. The name Russia is mentioned directly in the standard form used by southern Slavs, Rasiya. Unfortunately, this Etruscan text cannot be read in its entirety.

However, not all Old Russian texts are read completely to the last word today. But if entire lines and phrases are clearly readable in the Etruscan text, it can be concluded that the language for decoding was chosen correctly. And that language is Russian. This figurine of a boy with a goose in his hands was found in 1746 in the Tuscan estates… Jansen published it in his collection of Etruscan inscriptions. At the time this figurine was talked about a lot, and for a very long time, for a hundred years. But no one provided an explanation for the inscription made on this figurine. Here is the translation: The wind caught up with the white goose, surrendered itself willingly to Alpan. Behold! Geta went there naked, just hoping. And this is a bronze figurine of a boy with a bird, found in 1587. The figurine itself and the inscription made on the boy's leg have been repeatedly depicted. However, this text still cannot be explained. In the original, the text sounds as follows: Vole dae; mozhe cho za ni milek chaet. And here is the translation: I'm giving leave; maybe the dear one awaits something. This two-sided cameo was depicted on the title page of Ulrich Friedrich Kopp's book published in 1827. On one side of the cameo, there is an image of the nymph Menithea and Cupid flying towards her. However, the book did not mention anything about the inscription made on this cameo. In Etruscan: «Стерела Купида ранит Менифеи». In translation it means: Cupid's arrow wounds Menithea. On the second side of the cameo, there is an inscription consisting of seven lines. Яо, Саваоф, Адоней. Ей! коли ега лаится, идут в тартаройскотину. Translation: I, Shabuoth Adonai. Yea! Those who speak ill of him roll to Tartarus, the swine. It is astonishing why for so many years Etruscologists couldn't decipher this inscription. After all, it is written in ordinary Slavic letters, from left to right. We believe that it was a deliberate choice. The thing is, that during the Reformation era in Western Europe, evidence of the fact that the conquests of the 14th-15th centuries were Slavic, Russo-Turkish, including the Ottoman conquest of the 15th century, were being erased. In essence, an unofficial ban was imposed on reading old texts using Slavic languages. Furthermore, it was de facto forbidden to use Slavic languages to decipher allegedly unreadable inscriptions, including Etruscan ones. Relying specifically on Slavic languages, Tadeusz Wolański successfully deciphered not only Etruscan texts but also many other inscriptions found in Western Europe. These inscriptions, like the Etruscan ones, were considered unreadable. However, in Wolański's opinion, they can be deciphered as Slavic. Nevertheless, Wolański was well aware that his discovery would not be well-received in Western Europe. And therefore, in a letter to the archaeologist Karol Rogawski, he wrote: Are there no Slavic monuments in Italy, India, Persia, and even in Egypt? Do not the ancient books of Zoroaster, the ruins of Babylon, the monuments of Darius, the remnants of Persepolis covered in cuneiform script, contain inscriptions understandable to Slavs? The English, French, and Germans look at this without getting a clue. It can be said that Wolański's research on the history of Slavs in Western Europe was a great scientific feat. Therefore, the life of the scholar was not easy. In 1853, the Catholic Church included Wolański's books in the Index of Forbidden Books, and Polish Jesuits burned his books on a pyre. But they found it insufficient and demanded the execution of the scholar. It was only thanks to the intervention of Emperor Nicholas I that Wolański remained alive. It is believed that the Etruscans were pagans. Historians compare Etruscan gods with the gods of the Roman pantheon. Etruscan religion is polytheistic, like most beliefs in the ancient world of Italy and Greece. It shares many similarities with other religions of ancient Italy. Etruscan religion was heavily influenced by Greek religion. Many Greek deities found their way into Etruscan religion, and likewise, many Etruscan gods were discovered in Greek religion. Thus, it was an assimilation process. But here's something interesting. The Holy Book of the Etruscans turns out to have been known as Suda, which is "Book of

Judgment" or "Book of the Law." After all, the concept of law and judgment are closely related. It turns out that the Etruscans were familiar with the Russian word Sud, which stands for law and judgment. Parts of this book have survived to this day in descriptions of Roman authors. Scholars have long ago noticed the similarities between the Etruscan Holy book of "Suda" and the first chapters of "Genesis". Researchers invested a lot of effort into the explanation of the similarities between the text of the Suda and the Bible. However, since traditional historical accounts suggest that Etruscan and biblical authors lived in different eras, the task for historians from the Scaligerian school has been exceptionally challenging. They have been unable to solve it to this day. However, the authors of the New Chronology have found the answer to this question. According to the New Chronology, the Etruscan conquerors, or rather colonizers of Western Europe of the 14th century, were Christians, and obviously used the Christian Holy Books, in particular, the Books of the Christian Law. For example, the book Kormchy which they could have called the Book of Judgment because it pertains to the law and Christian Orthodox judgment. We only know the Etruscan book "Suda" through retellings by Roman, ancient, and Greek authors, or more precisely, as we now understand, by later editors. Unfortunately, we don't have the exact text. And it is not surprising at all that even from these retellings, it is evident that it parallels the Pentateuch (the first five books of the Bible). Marionas, a Franciscan monk from Florence links the ancient past of Etruria with the myths of the Genesis in his tractate entitled "On the Progeny, Nobility and Glory of Tuscia." According to his opinion, the sons of Noah populated the world after the deluge, and one of them, named Homer, decided to settle in Etruria. His descendants were the first to embrace the teaching of Christ. Alexander Nemirovsky, a Russian researcher of ancient Roman history and Etruscan culture, wrote in his book "Etruscans: From Myth to History" that in the search for information about the Tirrenians, that is, the Etruscans, the Bible cannot be excluded. It contains numerous references to the peoples of the Ancient Near East, the Black Sea region, and the Mediterranean. Indeed, in the chapter 10 of the Book of Genesis, it is stated: "And the sons of Javan; Elishah, and Tarshish, Kittim, and Dodanim. By these were the isles of the Gentiles divided in their lands; every one after his tongue, after their families, in their nations." It has long been suggested that Tarshish corresponds to the semi-legendary city of Tartessos, and historians themselves associate this city with the Etruscans. The well-known biblical name Tarshish could refer to Turks, Tatars, or Russians. It turns out that the compilers of the Bible were familiar with the Etruscans under the name Tarshish. By the way, it is understandable why in the Bible, the people of Tarshish are referred to as the sons of Javan, which corresponds to Ivan. According to our results based on the New Chronology, this was the Great Mongol conquest of the 14th century which was led by Tsar-Khan Ivan Kalita. Thus, the Bible truly did reflect the events of the 14th century AD well. It is known that in the late 15th century, a series of tractates on the Etruscans appeared in the capital of Tuscany, Florence, written by natives of Tuscany who were representatives of the Catholic Church. One of them, Cardinal Egidio da Viterbo, described Etruria not only as the hearth of the most ancient culture in Italy but also as the eternal protector and benefactor of religions. The cardinal saw no difference between the pagan Etruria and the Christian Tuscany of his time. The appearance of these tractates indicates that even in the late 15th century, the true history of the Etruscans was well remembered in Tuscany. However, modern historians, despite their knowledge of the Book of Judgment, biblical texts, and medieval writings, continue to write dissertations about the pagan beliefs of the Etruscans and their pre-Christian existence. The history of the conflict between Tuscany, that is, Etruria, and Rome, speaks to the extent of the Etruscan influence in

Europe. In the Middle Ages, Tuscany was one of the most powerful republics and for a long time contested Rome for supremacy in Italy. In 1619, Scottish scholar Thomas Dempster wrote an extensive work titled "Seven Books about Royal Etruria", based on the testimonies of ancient authors. In his work, Dempster wrote that the Etruscans introduced laws in Italy and were the first philosophers, geometers, priests, city builders, temple builders, inventors of war machines, physicians, artists, sculptors, and agronomists. It seems that Dempster did not even question that if the Etruscans had invented everything in the fields of technology and culture, what remains for the Greeks and Romans? However, the work of Dempster, written in the early 17th century, was published only a hundred years later, in 1723. The publication of this book marked a new wave of interest in the Etruscans because at that time Austria ruled over the territory of Tuscany. The people of Tuscany considered the Etruscans their ancestors, so the study of their glorious history appealed to their sense of patriotism. So, why wasn’t the Dempster's book published in the 17th century but only a hundred years later? In the 17th century, in Rome and in general in Western Europe a deliberate false version of world history was being written. This version omitted the Etruscans since all human achievements were attributed to the ancient Greeks and Romans. The Etruscans were a nuisance and got in the way, so they were pushed far into the past, even earlier than the 8th century BC, before the foundation of Rome. What happened as a result? It turned out that the history of the Russian conquerors of Western Europe in the 14th century, the Etruscans, was relegated to a distant and unreadable past, thus erasing the traces of Russian presence in Western Europe. However, Tuscany continued to fight for its version of history, in which the real Etruscans played the leading role, not mythical ancient Italian Romans and ancient Greeks. The Vatican, in turn, sought to establish its erroneous concept of the so-called ancient Rome and ancient Greece. Interests clashed, and Tuscany lost. Consequently, Dempster's work fell under the Roman ban. Only when Austrians entered Tuscany, did the delighted Florentines temporarily escape Roman control and attempted to seek revenge. They hastily published Dempster's book, but it was already too late. The false history of supposed ancient Italian Rome had firmly established itself in the pages of historical books. As a result, the Tuscans were simply ridiculed. Nevertheless, they continued to assert their correctness. In 1726, the Etruscan Academy was established in the city of Cortona. Its members consisted of noble gentlemen from many cities in Tuscany. The academy's reports stated that not only in Italy but also in Spain and Anatolia, almost all traces of artistic activity belonged to the Etruscans. In Cortona, the Museum of the Etruscan Academy was created. Followers of Scaliger long fought against the defiant Florentines who steadfastly stood their ground. It was only in the 19th century that their resistance was finally broken. The historical version of Rome eventually emerged victorious. Although, the fact remained a fact. Rome became Rome thanks to the Etruscans and entered history as one of the Etruscan cities. Once upon a time, the Etruscans wanted to make that city the stronghold of their dominance in Latium. But at that time, they naturally could not foresee that Rome, to which they helped emerge onto the historical stage, would destroy their dominant position in Italy. Furthermore, they did not anticipate that Rome would distort the facts of the Etruscans' past greatness. The Romans had a weakness for legends and myths. They indulged themselves in legends where truth was mixed with half-truths and often outright fabrications. For instance, the Romans insisted that the progenitor of the Roman people was the Trojan hero Aeneas, who ended up on the shores of Italy after the fall of Troy. But no matter how much the Romans opposed the Tuscans, they even borrowed the legend of Aeneas from the Etruscans. Thus, the myth of the glorious origin of Rome emerged, claiming that from the very beginning, it stood above all its

neighbors. Over time, this myth was recognized as historical reality and found its way into historical works. Historians began borrowing it from one another. The Etruscans were an important people, particularly during the archaic era, even before Rome transformed into a powerful state. Moreover, they exerted influence on Rome. In the early stages of its history, Rome had three Etruscan kings. The Etruscans made significant contributions to the formation of Italian civilization in antiquity, culturally, historically, and religiously. Today, I believe it is an acknowledged fact. Etruscan history is studied and recognized for its importance, just like the history of other peoples. The history of the Etruscans is only a part of the Slavic history of Western Europe. For several centuries, historians of the Scaliger school tirelessly worked to eradicate from the memory of peoples the facts of Slavic settlement in Europe. They denied the presence of Slavs in different lands and countries for so long and persistently that it resulted in an utterly absurd historical narrative. It appears that Slavs did not exist in ancient times at all. Where they came from is entirely unclear. By distorting the true past of the Slavs, Scaligerian historians rendered them homeless and landless. According to their theory, no ancient European region can have a Slavic name. And in the languages of Europe and Asia, these so-called scholars search for any roots except Slavic ones. However, many scholars saw nothing strange in the fact that traces of Slavic population were constantly discovered in many European lands. One of them was the distinguished Russian scholar Vasily Markovich Florinsky. In the 19th century, he was engaged in comparative archaeology. Florinsky sought to answer the question of which people the thousands of ancient burial mounds found in Siberia belonged to. Florinsky's answer to this question was clear and unambiguous. The burial mounds were constructed by the ancient population of Siberia, belonging to the Aryan race, which later became known as the Slavs. Florinsky conducted extensive research, comparing findings from the settlement that Schliemann declared to be Ancient Troy, objects belonging to the Adriatic and Baltic Veneti, with findings from the burial mounds of Northern and Southern Russia. The similarity of the discovered household items, ornaments, and pottery was so striking that there was no doubt, they were made by representatives of the same people, that is, the Slavs. It turns out that Asia Minor and a significant part of Western Europe in the past were populated by the same Slavic people as Russia and Siberia. Florinsky wrote that the Veneti were Adriatic or Italian Slavs, that they were part of the alliance of Trojan tribes that left Troy. The Veneti founded Venice and Padua. Interestingly, Venice stands on ancient wooden piles that are several hundred years old. It is believed that these piles were made of Siberian larch. The question arises: how were the builders of Venice connected to Siberia? Some scholars try to explain the wide distribution of similar Slavic objects throughout the Eurasian territory, but they do so within the framework of the erroneous Scaligerian chronology. Instead of placing all this vast Slavic material in the Middle Ages, they push it into the distant past, inventing theories about some ancient proto-Slavs. Another Russian scholar, Aleksey Khomyakov, wrote about the Veneti or Wends. In his works, he lists dozens of examples of traces of the Wends found in Western Europe. This includes the Austrian city of Vienna and the French province of Vendée. Lake Constance was formerly called the Lacus Venetus. Khomyakov wrote: “In the land of Wends rivers and cities bear the names of Sebra, Sevra, Sava … Fifteen towns and villages bear the name Bellegarde, which is not found elsewhere in France and which is translated as Alba.” As you know, Alba means white, and Bellegarde is simply a white town. Khomyakov also wonders how many different peoples historians arbitrarily attributed not to the Slavic root, but to the Germanic one, as if the Veneti did not exist in Europe. Although the Veneti inhabited the shores of the Adriatic and Baltic Seas since ancient times and sailed the stormy

waters of the Atlantic. And they were not scattered tribes but a numerous people who inhabited half of Europe. Alexander Dmitrievich Chertkov wrote that more than 25 books published in Germany between 1575 and 1842 report that Slavs have lived in German lands. Slavs were the builders of Leipzig, Delitzsch, Rochlitz and Dresden. However, all these numerous books were suppressed by Scaligerian historians. They clearly contradicted the official history. But Slavic roots in Europe are so deep that historians and archaeologists constantly encounter them. Slavs have been living in Germany since ancient times. For example, the Lusatian Serbs. And the Lusatian language is one of the West Slavic languages, spoken among the Lusatian Serbs, also known as Lusatians or Sorbs. The number of speakers of this language is 60,000 people, with 40,000 living in Saxony and 20,000 in Brandenburg. A new understanding of Etruscan history is also a new perspective on the ancient Russian history of the 14th to 16th centuries. Since the 17th century, we have been consistently indoctrinated with the belief that compared to European culture, Russian culture has always been at a very low level, and all the discoveries and achievements of the ancient world belong to the great European civilizations. However, the true history of the Etruscans tells the opposite. Slavs were the basis for the development and prosperity of European states, while the tribes inhabiting Europe for several centuries benefited from the scientific, cultural, and military heritage of Slavic peoples without any gratitude. Today, modern historians have the opportunity to reconstruct the true history of the Etruscans. They do not have to start from scratch. Their predecessors did tremendous work in the 19th century. But, as Wolański wrote even then, we Slavs will be able to bring these studies to completion only if our children and grandchildren choose to follow in our footsteps. Not only the history of the Etruscans but also the past of Ancient Rome itself is not as well-studied as it is commonly believed. Modern research indicates that the thick volumes dedicated to Roman civilization are merely rewriting the same legends invented by 16th-century historians. The authentic history of the peoples inhabiting the Italian Peninsula looks completely different. So, what is ancient Roman history? Is it genuine history or literary myth? We will try to unravel this in our next part, Symbols of Ancient Rome.

## Symbols of Ancient Rome

Who among us didn't get fascinated by the legends and myths of the Ancient World in our childhood? And they were not just entertaining stories for extracurricular reading. The legendary past of Ancient Greece and Ancient Rome occupies numerous pages in school history textbooks. Starting from the 18th century, knowledge of so-called ancient history became a measure of a person's education. That's why for centuries students have been memorizing the names of Roman gods and emperors, dates of great Roman battles, and the years of construction of grand Roman structures. In this part, we will try to figure out what this ancient Roman history is all about. Is it genuine past or literary myth? Looking at these books neatly arranged on the bookshelves, it seems as if the entire history of humanity is also organized and, most importantly, authentically known. It seems that every historical fact described in these books surely has documentary evidence. However, any serious researcher of world history knows that it is not the case, because most of these stories are based not on authentic documents but on myths and legends. The story of Francesco Petrarca, an outstanding writer of the Renaissance era, illustrates that legends often

originated out of thin air. It is believed that he was one of the first researchers of Ancient Rome and a passionate propagandist of its greatness. Petrarca was overcome with sacred awe at the sight of Italian ruins. Already being an authoritative and well-known poet, he entered the second period of his life, a period of wandering. In France, Flanders, and Germany, he acquainted himself with scholars, examined monastery libraries in search of forgotten manuscripts of ancient authors. But the ancient Roman monuments aroused greatest interest. Therefore, Petrarca set off for the Eternal City, which greeted him with a multitude of legends. For example, here they would say that Apollo was an astrologer, the god of Saracens, and even the devil. They considered Plato a physician, and Cicero a knight and troubadour. Many of these legends openly irritated Petrarca. They completely contradicted his idea of the supposed ancient antiquity. Moreover, all this chaos of myths and literary sources absolutely contradicted what Petrarch saw in reality. He wrote: Where are the Baths of Diocletian and Caracalla? Where is the Temple of Mars the Avenger? Where are the sanctuaries of Jupiter the Thunderer on the Capitoline Hill and Apollo on the Palatine Hill? In books, you find everything, but when you search for them in the city, it turns out they have disappeared, or only a pitiful trace remains. It must be said that Petrarca was a person with an acute, slightly hysterical perception of reality. Therefore, he constantly mistook his desires for reality. It was difficult for him to part with the image of Rome that he had once mentally drawn for himself. The haze of dreams clouded Petrarch's gaze so much that when looking at the clear inscription "Cestio Epulone" made on the famous mausoleum Pyramid of Cestius in Rome, he insisted that it was the tomb of Remus. From the multitude of stories heard and read, Petrarca selected only those legends that seemed historically accurate to him, thus creating a sort of unified legend. But apart from that, Petrarca did not leave to posterity any evidence of the antiquity of Rome, in which he was so convinced. Everyone knows the legend about the founders of Rome, the brothers Romulus and Remus. In this legend a she-wolf suckled the brothers. This classical motif is depicted in a bronze sculpture installed in the Capitoline Museum in Rome, which is known as the Capitoline Wolf. Art historians claim that the sculpture was made in the 5th century BC. Interestingly, only the wolf sculpture is dated to the 5th century, while the figures of the twins, according to the official version, were made between 1471 and 1509 AD. In other words, supposedly, the wolf stood alone for two thousand years. And in the 15th century, a certain master named Antonio del Pollaiolo created figures of the twins she nursed. But why do historians date the she-wolf to the 5th century BC? It is believed that supposedly ancient authors such as Cicero, Pliny, and Titus Livius mentioned this sculpture. According to some accounts, it stood on the Roman Forum, while others claim it was on the Capitoline Hill, where its replica is currently located. However, the description of the sculpture found in the works of these authors does not correspond to the image we see today. Ancient Roman historians wrote that the she-wolf was licking the twins, indicating that her muzzle was turned towards them. Therefore, it referred to a completely different sculpture. The first mention of this sculpture itself is dated to the 9th century AD and is attributed to a Benedictine monk. But in the Palazzo dei Conservatori, where the Capitoline Museum is currently located, the sculpture of the she-wolf was placed only in 1473, that is, in the second half of the 15th century by order of Pope Sixtus IV. Throughout its existence, the Capitoline Wolf sculpture has never been restored. However, in 1997, the local authorities responsible for the supervision of art monuments in Rome made the decision to finally carry out a complete restoration of this ancient sculpture. It was decided that the restoration work would be undertaken by an art restorer and metallurgy specialist named Anna Maria Carruba. The restoration of the sculpture took three years. Afterward, Ms.

Carruba made a sensational statement. The famous Capitoline Wolf was actually made in the Middle Ages, not using ancient techniques but rather a technology from a later period. The fact is that in ancient times, large bronze sculptures were cast in parts and then these parts were welded together, while the statue of the she-wolf was cast as a whole. However, this type of casting, in one piece, was only adopted in the 8th century AD. The transition to this type of casting, in one piece, was driven by the development of bell casting. In the 8th century, churches began to build bell towers, and bells were rung in them to call the faithful to service. But even large bells could not be welded together because it would affect the purity of the sound. It was from that time that they began to cast products without welding, in one single piece, just like bells. That's the difference. The results obtained through other methods of investigation suggest that the age of one of the world's most famous sculptures is exaggerated by at least 1,500 years. In order to determine the structure of the alloy and study the composition of the materials, we conducted thermoluminescence, carbon, mineralogical, and stone-graphic analyses of the earth remaining from the casting to determine its origin. These analyses yielded ambiguous results. The dating of the she-wolf varies between the 6th and 14th centuries AD. The analyses have never provided results confirming that the sculpture was made in the Etruscan era, that is, before Christ. However, historians, upon receiving these new data, are not rushing to rewrite the biography of the Capitoline Wolf. Many are skeptical of the research conducted by Ms. Carruba because she is an art restorer, not an archaeologist. However, the results she obtained were supported by a professional archaeologist, professor Adriano La Regina of the National Institute of Archaeology and Art History. I was immediately interested in Senora Carruba's work because she is a very attentive and serious specialist. She pays great attention to technical details and materials, especially when it comes to works of art. Many historians attach primary importance to the study of the aesthetic aspect and consider the analyses that use modern technologies to be of lesser importance. In any case, based on these studies regarding casting techniques and the analyses conducted, we can conclude that the she-wolf has a medieval origin. I am confident in this. Another fact that indicates the sculpture of the she-wolf was made in the Middle Ages is the following. Historians claim that in ancient Rome, there existed a special collection of documents that described the restoration of all monuments and any observations regarding their condition. Mentions of the she-wolf sculpture in this collection only appear in the 10th century. But are there any ancient depictions of the sculpture that have been preserved? There are no depictions of the Capitoline Wolf prior to the Carolingian era. The earliest depictions date back to the 14th century. The statue of the Capitoline Wolf is not the only work of art that historians of the Scaliger school have attributed to the distant ancient times. I can give an example of two other bronze artifacts located in Perugia. They are slightly larger than the she-wolf. One of the artifacts is a lion, and the other is a fantastic creature, a half-griffin, half-beast. These two large works of art, which have been the subject of much debate in the past, were considered ancient Etruscan works. However, it was later discovered that they were also medieval works because a document was found in the archives of Perugia mentioning payment for the production of these two figures. It is a reliable and authentic document. Unfortunately, there have been no documents found yet that confirm the medieval origin of the Capitoline she-wolf. Therefore, the museum is not in a hurry to change the official date of the statue's creation indicated on the plaque. Moreover, they try not to comment on the results of Anna Maria Carruba's research. The public should be given the opportunity to form their own opinion. This is an important matter. Museums are places of recognition and study for the public, not just for scholars. I believe that we

should provide the public with accessible tools to form their own opinions based on accurate data, documents, and reliable information. So, if historians stop persisting in their misconceptions and impartially study the results obtained through modern methods of researching ancient monuments, they will finally convince themselves that the statue of the Capitoline she-wolf was made no earlier than the 14th century AD. Chronological peculiarities also surround the famous equestrian statue of Marcus Aurelius. Modern historians claim that this statue was supposedly made between the 166th and 180th years, that is, in the 2nd century AD. However, for example, the medieval scholar Riccobaldo of Ferrara, who lived in the late 13th and early 14th centuries, claimed that the statue of Marcus Aurelius was cast and erected by the order of Pope Clement III. But Clement III lived not in the 2nd century but in the 12th century. This statement by Riccobaldo did not sit well with scholars who studied the history of Rome several centuries after him. For instance, the German historian and writer of the 19th century, Ferdinand Gregorovius, wrote in confusion: How could such a work in bronze be executed at such a low level of art that Rome had at the time? If we follow Gregorovius' logic, then according to him, the Romans in the Middle Ages were incapable of producing anything worthwhile. And many centuries earlier, during antiquity, they were highly skilled masters who confidently cast such massive bronze masterpieces as the statue of Aurelius. It is not only the date of the statue's creation that raises doubts. It is uncertain who created it and where it stood in ancient Rome. There is a hypothesis that the statue was initially placed in front of the Roman Forum. Today, it is nearly impossible to confirm or refute this. But the main mystery lies elsewhere. Since in the Middle Ages the statue was discovered quite by accident in one of the Roman squares, it was allegedly mistaken for an image of Constantine the Great rather than Marcus Aurelius. It is believed that this mistake is what saved it because during the grim era of the Middle Ages, the church deliberately destroyed ancient masterpieces as pagan heritage. However, Constantine, as is known, made Christianity the dominant religion of the Roman state and is admired by the church as a saint, so his image was preserved. But why did the Romans eventually come to believe that the ancient sculptor portrayed Marcus Aurelius and not Constantine? After all, there are no inscriptions on the statue. The pedestal on which it stands was made by Michelangelo only in the 16th century. It turns out that it's quite simple. In the 15th century, the librarian of the Vatican Apostolic Library, Bartolomeo Sacchi, examined the image of Marcus Aurelius on ancient coins. He thought that the resemblance was strikingly similar to the statue. That's how, based on a mere visual similarity, the identity of the rider and the time of the creation of this masterpiece were established. In the Italian capital, there is another historical monument whose extraordinary antiquity also raises doubts. It is Trajan's Column, erected in Trajan's Forum. It is believed that this monument is already 1800 years old. The column is covered with relief drawings from top to bottom. Historians claim that they depict events from the two wars of the Roman Emperor Trajan with the Dacians, which supposedly took place in the 2nd century AD. However, these claims are not supported by any concrete evidence because there is not a single inscription on the column itself, no names, dates, or geographical names. Moreover, at the top of the column is not a statue of Trajan, but a statue of Saint Peter, which was installed by the order of Pope Sixtus V in 1588. And in appearance and structure, the column closely resembles the pillars depicted on Orthodox icons. It is well known that in Christianity there was a custom of stylitism. Stylites or pillar hermits were righteous individuals who chose a special feat for themselves, standing on a pillar. Today, it is believed that stylites climbed to the tops of columns, towers, or rocks to seclude themselves from the world and devote themselves to piety and continuous prayer. However, it is more likely that stylites climbed the

pillars only at certain times to proclaim prayers, similar to what Muslim muezzins still do. Muslims built minarets for these purposes, and Christians, presumably, built pillars or bell towers. Today, only the voices of bells are heard from the top of Christian bell towers. In ancient times, bells were most often installed not on bell towers, but on low platforms or walls of bell towers. And the pillars that we now commonly associate with bell towers could be used mainly as minarets. This is depicted on ancient icons as well. For example, on icons of Saint Simeon the Stylite, he is depicted praying at the top of a pillar-bell tower. Therefore, it is likely that Christian bell towers and Muslim minarets had the same purpose. They were considered as elements of completely different architectural styles only from the 17th century, after the division of the unified Christian cult into several branches. Now let's return to Trajan's Column. Externally, it gives the impression of a monolithic structure, but there is a balcony with a railing at the top. This means that it can be ascended. Indeed, the description of the column mentions that it contains a spiral staircase inside, leading to the very top. It appears the column is a Christian structure that was originally built as a pillar-minaret for prayer. If that is indeed the case, it becomes clear why at the top of the column there is a statue of Saint Peter, who is considered the first Pope of Rome. As we have already mentioned, according to the traditional historical version, the statue was installed in 1588, so it is likely that the column itself was built around the same time. This version is also supported by the depictions on the column. The artist placed crescents, stars and Christian crosses on the shields of many warriors. Historians cannot provide an explanation as to why the shields of supposedly ancient warriors are adorned with Christian symbolism. There is not a single word about this in the literature describing Trajan's Column. However, if we shift the time of the construction of the column to the 16th century AD, everything becomes clear. The fact that the age of the column does not exceed 500 years can also be judged by the speed of its deterioration. It should be noted that scientists have been continuously observing ancient architectural monuments for only the last 300 years. But this time has been sufficient to make sure that from century to century, the rate of decay of ancient structures remains roughly the same. Now let's compare how Trajan's Column looked in the 19th century and how it looks today. It is evident that in about 100 years, the relief in many places has deteriorated; numerous cracks and dents have appeared. And if the column had indeed been built in the 2nd century AD, then after 1800 years, there would be almost nothing left of the unique relief. Let's take a walk through the Vatican Palace. These are the Borgia Apartments. They were built by order of Pope Nicholas V in the mid-15th century. From 1492 to 1503, they served as the residence of Pope Alexander VI Borgia. Prior to him, these rooms did not have such luxurious decorations. It was Pope Alexander VI who commissioned the artist Bernardino di Betto, known as Pinturicchio, and his apprentices to paint the rooms for two years. The Borgia Apartments consist of several rooms. On the vaults of one of them, known as the Room of the Sibyls, there is a unique zodiac. Interestingly, there is no detailed image of it on the internet or in albums. Only individual fragments are published. Until 2005, even during private visits to the museum, photography of this zodiac was not allowed. It was only Pope Benedict XVI, elected pontiff in 2005, who permitted visitors to take photographs in the Vatican Museums. The zodiac consists of eight individual paintings. Seven of them are dedicated to the seven planets known in ancient times: Jupiter, Mars, Venus, Mercury, Saturn, as well as the Moon and the Sun. The eighth painting, labeled “Astrology”, depicts the creation of the ancient Ptolemaic cosmology. Like in many other zodiacs, in this one a certain date is encrypted. It is natural to assume that it represents the date of the creation of the Ptolemaic cosmological system. After all, no other events are depicted in the zodiac. However, if

this is indeed the case, deciphering this zodiac may be highly undesirable for historians. Hence, it is impossible to find a complete image of the zodiac in open print. According to the Scaliger-Petavius chronology, the ancient astronomer Claudius Ptolemy, who created the famous model of the universe, lived in the 2nd century AD. It is believed that his system was used for one and a half thousand years, until the emergence of Nicolaus Copernicus' heliocentric system in the 16th century. Italian zodiacs are usually quite complex. Their creators aimed to make them incomprehensible at first glance. The correspondences between planets and constellations depicted in the zodiacs are sometimes so vague that it can be said in advance that such a horoscope will have many astronomical solutions. To determine which date is accurate, additional astronomical information is needed. Not all medieval zodiacs contain such information. Fortunately, the zodiac in the Room of the Sibyls does have such information. By using the Horos computer program, it is possible to find all the horoscope solutions within the range from 500 BC to 1900 AD. These calculations were conducted by mathematicians Anatoly Fomenko and Gleb Nosovskiy. It turned out that the horoscope in the Borgia Apartments has only one solution, August 28, 1228 AD. But if this zodiac contains the date of Ptolemy's invention of his cosmological system, which he outlined in his famous work "Almagest," then the traditional dating of Ptolemy's life is erroneous. Historians assert that Ptolemy lived in the 2nd century AD, while the date recorded in the zodiac, 1228 AD, corresponds to the 13th century AD. The difference is 1100 years. The date recorded in the "Astronomy" zodiac in the Borgia apartments fundamentally contradicts the Scaligerian dating of Ptolemy's era as supposedly the second century AD. In fact, it contradicts the Scaligerian picture of history as a whole. On the other hand, it perfectly fits into the New Chronology. Let me remind you that according to one of the most important results of the New Chronology, obtained by Anatoly Fomenko, Vladimir Kalashnikov, and myself in the mid-1990s, is the dating of the star catalogue Almagest. According to this dating, the catalogue, which was included in Ptolemy's work, could not have been compiled earlier than 600 AD and later than 1300 AD. Therefore, the date 1228 falls exactly within this interval of independent dating of the Almagest star catalogue, thus perfectly aligning with the New Chronology. Thus, it turns out that the Ptolemaic system of the universe, as outlined in the Almagest star catalog, was created in the 13th century AD. However, the Almagest as a whole could have been edited and supplemented until the 16th century when it finally fell into disuse with the advent of the theories of Copernicus and Tycho Brahe. It is believed that the Castel Sant'Angelo was built in the second century AD by the order of the Roman Emperor Hadrian, who constructed the castle as a mausoleum for himself and his family members. Historians claim that initially, the Castel Sant'Angelo was only a tomb but later became the residence of the Roman popes and simultaneously their treasury. At one time, there were quite a few ancient stone papal coats of arms on the walls of the castle, but over time, many of them were knocked down. For example, both coats of arms located at the very top, directly under the statue of the archangel Michael crowning the castle, were knocked down. Two more coats of arms were located in the most honorable place, directly above the entrance to the castle. Knocking them down was not so simple as they were on a sheer wall. Nevertheless, they were also destroyed. Why was this done? Some historians explain the destruction of the coats of arms by the fact that they belonged to Pope Alexander VI Borgia, who went down in history as a monster of debauchery. Since Borgia's successors strongly despised him, they knocked down all his coats of arms. But this explanation seems rather strange. Firstly, it is completely unclear why they disfigured the castle in which the popes continued to live. If they detested Borgia's coats of arms, they could have removed them neatly or replaced them with their

own coats of arms. It is strange that they did not do so. Even more strangely, while knocking down Pope Alexander Borgia's coats of arms, they inexplicably left the inscriptions with his name untouched. For example, beneath the knocked-down coat of arms located above the entrance to the castle, there is still a clear and intact inscription that reads, “Pope Alexander VI arranged this in the year of our Savior 1495.” Moreover, under some of the knocked-down coats of arms, we can see inscriptions with the names of other popes. Today it is difficult to understand exactly what was depicted on the papal coats of arms in Castel Sant'Angelo and why they were ruthlessly destroyed. One thing is clear: a thorough cleansing was carried out in the papal castle. The authentic ancient images hindered someone and were destroyed. The vague explanations of historians provide grounds to suggest that the entire history of Castel Sant'Angelo was not as it is commonly believed today. According to our reconstruction, Castel Sant'Angelo was built around 1453 by fleeing popes who carried away the treasure from the captured Constantinople, the state treasury. The treasury was transported on ships, and today the chests in which it was stored during those years are exhibited in the museum of Castel Sant'Angelo. The popes saved the treasures from the Ottomans who captured Constantinople in the mid-15th century. Upon arriving in their new location in Rome, the first thing the fleeing popes needed to do was to create a fortified secret treasury to store the brought gold. Time was of the essence, and perhaps that's why they didn't start building anew but rather used an existing structure. Most likely, at that time, there was a city theater in the castle, not an ancient tomb as historians claim. Castel Sant'Angelo stands on the very bank of the Tiber River. According to our reconstruction, the ships carrying the treasures, which departed from Constantinople before its capture by the Ottomans, stopped at the riverbank near the remnants of the old theater. This theater was urgently fortified, transformed into a powerful fortified castle, and the treasure was transferred there from the ships. This happened shortly before the year 1453 AD. For greater reliability, the transformed castle, originally a theater, was additionally surrounded by a fortification wall with towers at the corners. For some reason, later popes wanted to conceal the fact that their predecessors had found refuge in the old city theater. Therefore, they invented a legend that in ancient times, Castel Sant'Angelo was the mausoleum of the Roman Emperor Hadrian. To make it more convincing, historians even created a model of the mausoleum, which, by the way, strongly resembles the theater. Even today, it is evident that Castel Sant'Angelo, first and foremost, is a fortified secret treasury, modeled after Egyptian pyramids. In our previous parts, we discussed that according to the theory of Fomenko and Nosovskiy, the pyramids were secret royal treasuries of the Great Russian Empire of the 14th-15th centuries. Certainly, this did not prevent them from simultaneously serving as temples or tombs. The pyramids were an ideal place for the secret storage of treasures. They couldn't be easily plundered because they were in plain sight of the entire population. Such audacious theft of the treasury would be seen as sacrilege. It is possible that the pyramid could only be opened in the personal presence of the king. To enter the treasury, one had to first move a multi-ton stone blocking the entrance in the pyramid's wall, then proceed into the inner chamber without triggering any of the traps prepared for unwelcome guests. Finally, after taking the treasures, one had to make the entire journey back. It is clear that all this could not be done unnoticed. In the Castel Sant'Angelo, the path to the inner chambers goes through a spiral ascent gradually rising within the stone structure of the castle. The ascent was made spacious, presumably to accommodate loaded wagons. However, it was well suited for firing at attackers during an assault. Additionally, just before the entrance to the inner chambers of the castle, the passage narrows. Above it, there is a wide well through which attackers could be targeted from above, and if

necessary, the passage could be blocked completely, denying access inside. Apparently, this was the old imperial way of safeguarding the treasury. This is how the Castel Sant'Angelo was designed. The Vatican is believed to have been founded in the fourth century AD. According to the commonly accepted chronology, it was during this time that Emperor Constantine the Great embraced Christianity and made it the dominant religion in the Roman Empire. However, Vatican guidebooks state that all the buildings in the Vatican today were constructed no earlier than the second half of the 15th century. The oldest structure in the Vatican is considered to be St. Peter's Basilica. It is commonly believed that it was built in the 4th century, during the time of Constantine the Great, and subsequently underwent renovations. However, this is not the case. Historians themselves acknowledge that Emperor Constantine the Great ordered the construction of a completely different basilica on the tomb of the Apostle Peter, which no longer exists. It is reported that soon after its construction, it was heavily damaged. The alleged culprit was Pope Damasus I, who ordered the excavation of canals in the vicinity. As a result of this construction, water flows were directed towards the basilica, which led to its destruction. Interestingly, despite this, Pope Damasus was canonized and a courtyard in the Vatican is named after him, the Courtyard of Saint Damasus. After the destruction of the first basilica, the current St. Peter's Basilica was constructed, which many mistakenly consider to be very ancient, but it was actually built in the 16th and 17th centuries. In 1626, it was consecrated by Pope Urban VIII. But was there ever a first basilica at all? Let's look at several old drawings depicting the Vatican in the 16th century. Here, for example, is an ancient fresco from 1537-1541, located in the Castel Sant'Angelo in Rome. It shows Bramante Theatre, descending the slope of the hill and connecting the Belvedere Papal Castle, located at the top of the hill, with the Borgia Apartments. The Castel Sant'Angelo is visible in the distance to the right. However, in the foreground or slightly to the left, the St. Peter's Basilica should be visible, but it is not there. There is no ancient basilica depicted here either. Instead, there is a pond on which a naval spectacle is taking place. All around is empty space. Looking at this fresco, it becomes clear why historians use the word theatre in a figurative sense when referring to Bramante Theatre. It's as if to say that it was not actually a theatre and it received that name by mistake. However, the fresco clearly shows that the lower part of the theatre was a pond used for maritime performances. Above, in the Belvedere courtyard, knightly tournaments were held. One such tournament, organized by Pope Pius IV to celebrate the marriage of his relatives, is depicted in a preserved ancient fresco. Therefore, there was no ancient basilica above the tomb of St. Peter during that time. Let's take a look at another old painting depicting the Vatican in the 16th century. In this painting, the upper part of the Bramante Theatre is shown. In the 16th century, it housed a collection of supposedly ancient marble sculptures that belonged to Pope Julius II. Unfortunately, the location of St. Peter's Basilica is not captured in this painting. However, it is clear that there is an open field surrounding the Bramante Theatre in all directions. In the middle of the 16th century, it was still completely uninhabited. It is unlikely that it would have remained so empty if a majestic basilica had been standing there since the 4th century, erected by the order of Constantine the Great himself. Here is a drawing from the Schedel's ‘Nuremberg Chronicle’ supposedly issued in 1493. The Vatican is also depicted in this drawing. There is a fortress on a high hill, likely the Belvedere. Below, there is a papal palace resembling a medieval knight's castle. And in the place of St. Peter's Basilica, there is an ordinary house with the inscription ‘St. Peter’ on it. It is evident that this house bears little resemblance to a church. Most likely, this inscription was added to the drawing later. The Vatican of the 16th century is also depicted in the famous ‘Cosmographia’ by Sebastian Münster, supposedly

from 1550. The drawing clearly shows the Castel Sant'Angelo and the bridge over the Tiber. Nearby on the hill, the Belvedere is visible. However, the Bramante Theatre does not yet exist. From the Castel Sant'Angelo, a fortress wall extends, connecting it to the papal palace, which is built like a knight's castle with a tall watchtower. Next to this palace, there should be the Old Saint Peter's Basilica, supposedly located where the current Saint Peter's Basilica stands. However, there is no inscription indicating it. At the same time, the papal palace is labeled ‘Palatium papae.’ Could it be that the papal palace held more significance for Sebastian Münster than the basilica erected by Constantine the Great over the tomb of the Apostle Peter? It is highly unlikely. Most probably, there simply was no basilica there in the 16th century. If, according to historians, the Vatican has more than 1,500 years of continuous history, then the Vatican Library should have existed for an equal number of years. Many people believe this to be the case. However, as the historians themselves report, the famous papal library was only established in the 15th century. Though, they do not explain why the thought of creating a book depository did not occur to the popes for a thousand years. It was only in 1475 that Pope Sixtus IV issued a bull to establish the library. It is known that its foundation was based on the collection of Pope Nicholas V, consisting of 834 Latin codices. The historians of the Vatican do not provide information on how the pope came to possess such a number of manuscripts. Supposedly, he personally gathered them somewhere for his own use before becoming pope and then brought them to the Vatican. Nicholas V was at the head of the Vatican from 1447 to 1455, which is 20 years before Sixtus IV. Interestingly, in 1475, the papal library already had 2,527 Greek and Latin manuscripts. If we exclude Nicholas V's collection, the library had 1,693 books at the time of its foundation. If Roman popes had been collecting and preserving these books since the 4th century, as is often believed, it is not surprising that such a large collection had accumulated over a thousand years. Book production in the Middle Ages was expensive, so they were carefully preserved. Furthermore, books were essential for religious services. But if the library was actually founded only in the 15th century, where did such a large number of books come from? In our opinion, the library appeared in the Vatican during the reign of Pope Nicholas V at the time of the Vatican's foundation. Presumably, the Imperial Library of Constantinople was transported from the city captured by the Ottomans. Initially, it contained about 800 books. Most likely, Pope Nicholas V did not personally gather books here and there. The foundation of the library was based on the old Imperial Library. Over time, the number of books increased, and within 20 years, approximately 2,500 books were collected. By 1475, a considerable collection had formed, leading to the establishment of the library. Thus, everything happened naturally. The chosen location for the Vatican library is also interesting. It was situated in the lower floor of the northern wing of the papal palace. Before the establishment of the library, it had been a cellar or storeroom. It is strange that the popes did not find a more suitable place to store the books. Anatoly Fomenko and Gleb Nosovskiy argue that there is nothing surprising about it. The fact that the Vatican Library had to be accommodated in a cellar or storeroom indirectly confirms our belief that the Vatican was still under construction in the mid-15th century. There was a shortage of space, which is why the library had to be placed in some former utility room. The Vatican Library obtained a more spacious location only a hundred years later, during the reign of Pope Sixtus V in the late 16th century. Upon Sixtus V's order, the architect Domenico Fontana built a transverse wing in the Belvedere Courtyard, on the site of Bramante's original staircase. The papal library was then housed there. The walls of the new luxurious building were adorned with paintings depicting ancient libraries and inventors of writing. And, naturally, they depicted episodes from the history of Pope Sixtus V's

reign. Certainly, the chronological gap of over a thousand years between the supposed foundation of the Vatican in the 4th century and the appearance of the Vatican Library in the 15th century is so noticeable that historians are forced to explain it somehow. However, their explanations, as is often the case, sound completely unconvincing. Historians say, Yes, the Vatican Library was only founded in the 15th century. But it should not be assumed that there was no library in the Vatican before that. There was a library, just a secret one. So secret that nobody outside knew anything about it. Therefore, medieval records about it did not survive. The existence of a secret library is just a speculation that cannot be verified today. Therefore, it is evident that such a strange explanation does not explain anything. The Capitoline she-wolf, Castel Sant'Angelo, the statue of Marcus Aurelius, these are just a small part of the so-called ancient monuments, in whose history strange contradictions have been discovered. For other little-known facts of world history and new research by the authors of the New Chronology, read the full series books.